

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 22

February 1958

No. 6

EDITORIAL NOTE

This special issue commemorates the twentieth anniversary of the *Gaines vs Canada* decision by the United States Supreme Court that initiated a sequence of events of progressively profound influence on American society.

Uniform provision of educational opportunity for all youth in the South has assumed the function of a test variable. Efforts to secure the same educational provisions for Negro youth have revealed significant facts about our society; characteristics of the social structure, critical ideological stresses and strains, conflicting loci of political power, and the differential operation of major social institutions. As the controversy continues, educational opportunity is seen more clearly to depend upon the kind of society we have, the degree to which presumed universals in our value system permeate deviant culture areas, and tolerance of regional and local variations in social norms.

The initial legal advocacy of provision of university and college training opportunities without disparate distinctions was not intended to test the validity of our democratic presumptions; rather, there was the assumption that democratic values were sufficiently pervasive and respect for legal institutions sufficiently great to permit removal of educational deprivation.

State and local power group policy in regard to higher education as well as toward Negroes is indicated in the celerity of improvement of higher education in the South. Little comfort indeed may be taken in the superiority of educational advantages for white youth over those for Negro youth when by national norms, to say nothing of standards of adequacy, they are so patently deficient.

We undertake here an appraisal of developments in the provisions for the higher education of Negroes in the South over the twenty years since the Gaines decision.

Lewis W. Jones is Director of Social Science Research at Tuskegee Institute.

Copyright, 1959, by the Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

THE LLOYD GAINES STORY

Lucile H. Bluford

Who was Lloyd Gaines?

A new generation has been born and has grown to adulthood since the United States Supreme Court handed down the famous Gaines case decision on December 12, 1938. A large number of young Americans who today are receiving new educational advantages from a more recent and more familiar decision of the Supreme Court do not know that the Gaines case was the first in a long series of N.A.A.C.P.—backed suits which finally led to the most momentous of them all—the 1954 decision declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional.

The ruling in the Gaines case was a far cry from the sweeping opinion of May 17, 1954, but two decades ago it was hailed as the most far-reaching decision affecting Negroes handed down by the highest tribunal in many, many years. It was considered the greatest victory Negroes had won since freedom. And so it was.

The Gaines decision established the principle of "equality of education." The states which practiced segregation—some 16 of them—were given a choice. In the Gaines decision, Missouri was told by the Supreme Court in a 6 to 2 decision either to admit Lloyd Gaines to the University of Missouri Law School or to provide a law school for Negroes within the state borders. It was an "either-or" decision. It also declared unconstitutional Missouri's plan of paying the tuition of Missouri Negro students at state universities in adjacent states such as Kansas, Nebraska and Iowa if they chose to take a course of study not offered at Lincoln University, the state-supported school for Negroes at Jefferson City.

But this article is not to deal with the Gaines decision and its legal implications, but with Lloyd Gaines, the person; the central figure in a historic case. The story of Lloyd Gaines is colorful and dramatic and in its concluding phases completely mystifying.

Gaines was a St. Louis youth, the youngest son of Mrs. Carrie Gaines who moved to St. Louis with her five children from Oxford, Mississippi in 1926 when Lloyd was a lad of 14.

Lloyd helped work his way through high school and college receiving assistance from two older brothers, Milton and George. As a student, he was above average. He was graduated from Vashon High School in 1931, completing his high school course in three years. He stood first in a graduating class of 50 students and received the Alumni Award and a \$250 scholarship for placing first in an essay contest.

From Vashon, Gaines went to the Stowe Teachers' College in

St. Louis for a year, then entered Lincoln University in Jefferson City, from where he was graduated in August 1935, as an honor student and as President of the senior class.

Gaines wanted to be a lawyer. He could have studied law at the Universities of Kansas, Iowa or Nebraska, with the state of Missouri paying his tuition, but he wanted to study law in his own state university which the taxes of his family helped support.

So, following his graduation from Lincoln, Gaines applied for admittance to the University of Missouri Law School at Columbia, located about thirty miles from Jefferson City, where he had received his A.B. degree.

As expected, his application was turned down by the Missouri University registrar, S. W. Canada, on the grounds that Missouri's constitution called for "separate education of the races."

Since no law school was provided for Negroes at that time in the state of Missouri, Gaines, backed by the N.A.A.C.P., filed a petition for a writ of mandamus on January 24, 1936, asking the Boone County Circuit Court at Columbia to order the university to admit him to the law school of Missouri University.

In July 1936, after several days of hearings on Gaines' request, the Boone county court denied the writ. Gaines, still backed by the N.A.A.C.P., appealed to the Missouri Supreme Court which, on December 9, 1937, upheld the Boone county court in refusing to order Gaines admitted to the law school.

The N.A.A.C.P. appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, the first case taken to the high court in the fight for educational opportunities for Negroes.

While his case was pending in the courts, Lloyd Gaines entered the University of Michigan. Instead of the law school, however, he entered the graduate school and received his master's degree in Economics in 1937. He then obtained employment as a WPA clerk in the Michigan State Civil Service Department at Lansing.

He was still working at that job when the Supreme Court handed down the decision, ordering the state of Missouri to admit Gaines to the Missouri University Law School or to establish a school for him somewhere in the state.

Shortly after the Supreme Court ruled in his case, Gaines returned home to St. Louis, arriving there on December 31, 1938. He told friends and associates, as well as newspaper reporters, that he intended to remain there until September when he expected to enter the law school at the University of Missouri.

In the meantime, Gaines began working in a filling station in St.

Louis. He continued to express his determination to enter the law school of Missouri University in the fall. In an address before a meeting of the St. Louis N.A.A.C.P. branch on January 9, 1939, Gaines said that he was "ready, willing and able to enroll in the law department at the university in September and had the fullest intention of doing so."

While Gaines was planning to enter the University of Missouri, the state, given a choice by the Supreme Court, decided that it would establish a law school at Lincoln University of Gaines and other Negroes rather than admit them to the University of Missouri Law School.

Over the vigorous protests of Negro citizens all over the state, the state legislature passed House bill No. 195, popularly known as the Taylor bill, which gave Lincoln University the authority to "establish whatever graduate and professional schools are necessary to make Lincoln University equal to the University of Missouri." Negroes fought the Taylor bill, calling it a "subterfuge" and a means of circumventing the Supreme Court decision. Nevertheless, plans went ahead quickly for the opening of the Lincoln University Law School in September 1939.

As the state moved to build a law school to keep Lloyd Gaines out of the University of Missouri, the Gaines case was still being considered in the courts. The Missouri Supreme Court, with the directive of the United States Supreme Court before it, set a date for a hearing to determine whether the state of Missouri, through the Taylor bill, had met the requirements of the Supreme Court decision or whether the University of Missouri Law School should admit Lloyd Gaines in September.

The hearing was held on May 22, 1939. Since the state was in the process of building a law school at Lincoln University, the state supreme court reserved judgments. In August it sent the case back to the Boone County Circuit Court,

At the May hearing, N.A.A.C.P. lawyers argued that the Taylor bill, with its appropriation of only \$200,000 to set up a law school and for the "full development" of Lincoln University as a school equal to the University of Missouri was wholly inadequate to meet the requirements of the Supreme Court and that the only way for Missouri to comply with the law would be to admit Gaines to the University of Missouri law school. At this hearing before the Missouri Supreme Court, Lloyd Gaines was not present but his absence was not considered significant inasmuch as only legal arguments were being heard by the court.

The Lincoln University board of curators had instructed Lincoln's President, Dr. Sherman D. Scruggs, to set up a school of law by September 1, 1939. Missouri University lawyers had used this action on the part of Lincoln University as grounds for asking the state supreme court to rule against the admittance of Gaines to Missouri University. The state supreme court, however, refused to rule in advance on the adequacy of the proposed Lincoln law school and sent the case back to the Boone county court for later review.

Lincoln University decided to establish its new school of law in St. Louis rather than on the Jefferson City campus. By August, space had been rented in the Poro building in St. Louis to house the school, a law faculty of four had been employed, with the dean coming from Howard University, and a law library of 10,000 volumes had been purchased.

On September 21, 1939, the school opened with 30 students enrolled, most of them from the St. Louis area. Lloyd Gaines was not among them, as the N.A.A.C.P. contended that the hastily-built Lincoln University school was not equal to that at the University. A St. Louis organization called the Colored Clerks' Circle formed a picket line around the "Jim Crow" school.

The next legal step was a hearing before the Boone county court to determine whether or not the Lincoln University school was equal to that at the University of Missouri. The hearing was set for October 7, 1939, in Columbia. In preparation for that hearing, the N.A.A.C.P.'s chief counsel, Charles H. Houston, who had carried the Lloyd Gaines case from the beginning with the assistance of St. Louis Attorneys Sidney R. Redmond and Henry D. Espy, came to the state of Missouri about a week ahead of time to inspect the new Lincoln University school and to take depositions prior to the Columbia hearing.

It was during the taking of depositions at St. Louis that Gaines' disappearance fell upon the N.A.A.C.P. attorneys like a bombshell. The four law instructors at the Lincoln University Law School each had been questioned by the N.A.A.C.P. lawyers. The deposition of Plaintiff Gaines was next. He was to be asked whether he considered the Lincoln University Law School equal to that at the University of Missouri and whether he would enroll there.

When his name was called for questioning, Gaines failed to respond. He was not in the room. He was nowhere to be found. It was not until that moment that his lawyers realized that their client was missing.

The nation's press was asked to cooperate in trying to locate

Gaines who apparently just dropped from sight. His picture was carried in newspapers all over the nation. Appeals were made to anyone knowing the whereabouts of the N.A.A.C.P.'s plaintiff to communicate with Attorney Sidney R. Redmond but nothing was heard from Gaines.

Gaines' mother and his brothers and sister had not heard from Lloyd since he left St. Louis in April, 1939, to make a speech for the N.A.A.C.P. branch in Kansas City. Gaines spoke in Kansas City at the Centennial Methodist Church on April 27, and left by train for Chicago on April 28, saying that he was going to spend a few days there and then return to St. Louis. I accompanied him to the Union Station the night he left Kansas City and saw him board the train for Chicago. He never returned to St. Louis as far as his family and his lawyers know.

Nearly twenty years have now passed since the disappearance of Lloyd Gaines. Nobody knows whether he is dead or alive. His disappearance was the source of great embarrassment to the N.A.A.C.P. Legal action to determine whether or not the law school at Lincoln University was equal to that of the University of Missouri had to be dropped because there was no plaintiff. The N.A.A.C.P. advertised extensively for Gaines. The cooperation of the Selective Service System was sought during World War II in an effort to locate the missing youth but to no avail.

The mystery of Gaines' disappearance may never be solved. But his dropping out of the picture failed to halt progress in the educational field in the state of Missouri. The Lincoln University Law School operated for several years, then was closed when Supreme Court rulings which followed the Gaines decision went further than the "separate but equal" theory and declared that separation on the basis of race deprived students of their constitutional rights.

Today, the University of Missouri is open not only to Negro law students but to undergraduates as well. The color line has been erased in Missouri's schools, as far as the integration of students is concerned, although Lloyd Gaines, who started it all, has vanished into thin air.

The words of Roy Wilkins, issued in 1939 shortly after the Gaines decision, have proved prophetic. He commented: "On the Gaines case hinges not only the educational welfare of Negroes in Missouri, but it will influence the whole system of education for Negroes in southern and border states." The Gaines case has done exactly that. It was the first peg upon which the historic decisions of 1954 and 1955 were built.

Miss Lucile Bluford is Executive Editor of *The Kansas City Call*.

TWENTY YEARS OF COURT DECISIONS AFFECTING HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH 1938-1958

Jessie P. Guzman

INTRODUCTION

The years 1938-1958 have been momentous for higher education in the Southern Region.¹ Epoch-making decisions of Federal, State and local courts have affected revolutionary changes in this phase of public activity. Doors of institutions formerly tightly closed against Negroes have been opened to them for professional, graduate and undergraduate training. As of November 1, 1958, only four states in the region still maintain institutions for white students only—South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. And in Mississippi alone has there been no effort through court action on the part of Negroes to gain admittance to state universities and other schools.

Beginning in 1896, when the U. S. Supreme Court pronounced its "separate but equal" doctrine, all public education in seventeen states and the District of Columbia became legally separate and unequal. But early in the 1930's the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which has guided this legal revolution and has, upon request of litigants, participated in most of the suits prosecuted, after careful study, made a "blueprint" for a systematic legal attack against this discriminatory principle. The university level, it was decided, was the best place to begin since it was there that no provision had been made for education of Negroes in any of the states. Then, too, it was thought that it would be an insurmountable financial burden for the South to provide opportunities through building separately for Negroes medical schools, law schools, engineering schools, graduate schools and all the variety of offerings available at most state universities for whites.

The campaign really began in 1933 in North Carolina when a student sought admission to the law school of the university of that state, but lost his suit on a technicality. This case was followed by one in Maryland where Donald Murray, an Amherst College graduate, sued for admittance to the University of Maryland Law School. He was successful when the State Court of Appeals, in 1935, ordered the university to open its law school to him. Other such efforts were made about the same time in Tennessee and Virginia, but failed.

But starting in 1938, the careful state-by-state planning began to bring tangible results. Most of the court action instituted and participated in by the N.A.A.C.P.'s legal defense staff was success-

¹ As used here the South includes the seventeen states and the District of Columbia formerly practicing legal segregation in public education.

ful, although won after a great deal of legal resistance by state and school officials.

The decisions presented in this review fall into two periods—those handed down under the United States Supreme Court's "separate but equal" ruling of 1896 in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*; and those decided after the May 17, 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* by the same court.

Not every suit taken to the courts or won by those who instituted them is included, but those cited are representative and reveal the efforts that were made and results achieved during two decades of litigation to remove racial educational inequalities. All Negro litigants sought a right under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

DECISIONS RENDERED 1938-1954

During this period the cases taken to the courts had for their purpose the testing of the "separate but equal" principle and the outlawing of segregation. They sought absolute and complete equalization of curricula, faculty and physical equipment of white and Negro schools; and later, the outlawing of segregation per se.

The test in Missouri was the first to reach the U. S. Supreme Court, after a Negro, Lloyd Gaines, sought admission to the law school of the state university in *Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada*.² The majority opinion was that no state could send Negroes outside its borders for an education while it was training its white citizens at home. It further said that if Missouri was offering legal education to white citizens, it would have to offer it to Negro citizens, even if there was only one Negro in the state who wanted to study law. The court concluded:

We are of the opinion that the ruling was an error, and that petitioner was entitled to be admitted to the law school of the state university in the absence of other and proper provision for his legal training within the state.

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Missouri is reversed and the case is remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

Coming three years after the suit was initiated, it was the first time the Supreme Court had ruled on this point. The court not only had applied its 1896 principle of equality of treatment for the state to follow, but also, it set a rigorous standard for such equality. This

² 305 U. S. 337 (1938).

case introduces the duty-to-act theory into state higher education, and the federal courts spent the next fifteen years developing this concept in terms of what constitutes "proper action." The entire scope of graduate and professional training for Negroes was affected. As for Missouri, there were three things the state could do: (1) establish an adequate school of law at Lincoln University; (2) admit Gaines to the University of Missouri; or (3) discontinue legal education for both whites and Negroes.

Following the Gaines decision legal action was initiated in several states of the South with the result that additional educational provisions were made for Negro students at tax-supported institutions already being maintained to teach Negroes.

A school of Journalism was established at Lincoln University in Missouri in 1940. A school of engineering was authorized at Kentucky State College for Negroes in 1945. Law schools were organized at Langston University in Oklahoma and at South Carolina State College for Negroes. The Supreme Court had enunciated the doctrine that a state could not remain "inactive" in a given sphere of activity in regards to one race where it had been "active" in the same area towards another.³

As a result of *G. W. McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*,⁴ the early policy and practice of segregating Negro students in some institutions after they had been admitted were practically abolished. Another significant fact in both the *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* cases, decided on the same day, June 5, 1950, was that the Justice Department urged the Supreme Court to repudiate its 54-year-old "separate-but-equal" doctrine and declare segregation in education illegal, taking the position that segregation in itself discriminates. The Court's decision, it asserted, would have large influence "in determining whether the foundations of our society shall continue to be undermined by the existence and acceptance of racial discriminations having sanction of law."

Denied admission under state laws to the University of Oklahoma Graduate School in January 1948, McLaurin, a retired professor of Langston, the Negro college, who wished to pursue courses toward a doctorate in education, filed complaint in Federal District Court on August 5th, which court held that the state was constitutionally duty-bound to provide him with the education he desired as soon

³ This concept is fully developed in: Charles V. Hamilton, "State Inaction Concerning the Negro Under the 14th Amendment" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1957.)

⁴ 339 U. S. 641 (1950).

as it provided it for any other group. It further held that to the extent Oklahoma statutes denied him admission, they were unconstitutional and void.

In compliance with this decision, Oklahoma amended its statutes to permit the admission of Negroes to formerly all-white institutions when such institutions offered courses not given in Negro schools but instruction was to be given on a segregated basis, under which terms McLaurin was admitted.

He was required to sit apart from the class in an ante-room, assigned a desk on the mezzanine floor of the library, deprived of the use of the stacks, denied use of desks in the reading room, and assigned a special table in the cafeteria, where he ate at a time different from that of other students. While later some of these restrictions were modified, he was still discriminated against.

With the Federal District Court refusing his request of October 7 for relief, the plaintiff appealed to the Highest Tribunal for the removal of these discriminatory conditions.

Like those of Gaines and McLaurin, *Sweatt v. Painter*⁵ stands out as a highlight during these twenty years. The court stated that the legal education offered Sweatt at a newly established law school for Negroes was not, and *could* not be, equal to that which he would receive if admitted to the law school of the University of Texas. There were certain "intangible" inequalities that went beyond the number of volumes in the library, size of the faculty, etc.

In a series of cases the federal courts began ordering the admission of Negro students using the *Sweatt, McLaurin* language and standards as precedent. Suits were successfully prosecuted in Delaware, Virginia, Maryland, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The courts were enunciating the doctrine that "equal" facilities meant the "same" facilities. In higher education, separate facilities were inherently unequal. The particular focal points shifted: junior colleges, undergraduate, graduate, law schools, schools of nursing, but the legal reasoning remained constant.⁶

DECISIONS RENDERED 1954-1958

With the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* decision of 1954, the cycle was completed. The court had finally concluded that segregation *per se* was unconstitutional at all levels of

⁵ 339 U. S. 629 (1950).

⁶ See: *Wilson v. Louisiana*, 340 U. S. 864 (1951); and *Wichita Falls Junior College District v. Battle*, 204 F. 2d 632 (1954), (Certiorari denied, 347 U. S. 974).

public education. The fact that Chief Justice Warren relied heavily on the *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* language was a clear indication that the *Brown* doctrine would be used in future cases involving higher education in addition to previous precedents.

Federal court decisions further invalidated segregation practices in Texas and North Carolina.⁷

A Negro student was legally unsuccessful in being admitted to the University of Georgia. Louisiana State University admitted one to its undergraduate division, but he chose to attend college elsewhere.⁸

Two Negro students were successful in removing racial barriers to the University of Florida and the University of Alabama, respectively, but they were subsequently denied admission on grounds other than race.⁹

Tennessee was the focus of two cases wherein the courts refused to allow state funds to be withheld from the Austin Peay College because of the admission of Negro students, and the United States Circuit Court rejected a "gradual" plan for the admission of Negroes to Memphis State College.¹⁰

After Negro students, by court orders in 1953 and 1954, had gained admittance to institutions of higher learning in Louisiana, the 1954 state legislature enacted Acts 15 and 249 to get them out again. This new legislation affected even those students far advanced toward a graduate degree. The additional requirements placed a burden on Negro students, for none had been able to obtain certificates of good moral character to be furnished by local and parish school officials required by Act 15, because Act 249 made "advocating or in any manner performing any act toward bringing about integration of the races within the public school system a cause for

⁷ See: *Atkins v. Matthews*, U. S. Dist. Ct., Eastern Dist., Texas, Civ. No. 1104, Dec. 19, 1955; *Write v. Smith*, U. S. Dist. Court, Western Dist., Texas, Civ. No. 1616, July 25, 1955; and *Frasier et al. v. Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina, et al.*, 134 F. Supp. 589 (1955).

⁸ See: *Ward v. Regents of University System*, U. S. Dist. Ct., Northern Dist., Ga., 1957, Civ. No. 4355, and *Tureaud v. Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University*, 347 U. S. 971 (1954).

⁹ See: *Florida ex rel Hawkins v. Board of Control, et al.*, U. S. Dist. Ct., Northern District, Tallahassee Division, Florida, 1958, Civ. No. 643, and *Lucy v. Adams*, U. S. Dist. Ct., No. Dist., Alabama, 1956, Civ. No. 652. An excellent summary of the *Lucy* case is presented by Lewis W. Jones, "Two Years of Desegregation in Alabama," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 25, No. 3, p. 205, 1956.

¹⁰ See: *Davidson v. Cape*, Chancery Court, Part II, Davidson County, Tennessee, 1956, No. 77014, and *Booker v. State of Tennessee Board of Education*, 351 U. S. 948, (1956).

removal of a permanent teacher." Thus principals and superintendents would lose their jobs if they signed the certificates.

In three class actions, *Arnease Ludley v. Board of Supervisors*; *Jack Bailey v. State Board of Education*; and *Alma Lark v. State Board of Education*, Negro students sought declaratory judgment and injunctive relief and attacked the constitutionality of these acts. On April 15, 1957, the Federal District Court ruled in their favor and granted a preliminary injunction. The Court, basing its decision on the intent of the State Legislature, said that this legislation was unconstitutional because the Legislature intended to discriminate against plaintiffs and "to circumvent the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment." The Court held that the combined effect of Acts 15 and 249 of 1956 was the same as if the Legislature had provided, as it did in 1954, "all public schools in the state . . . shall be operated separately for white and colored children. The fact that transparent device is used, calculated to effect this same result, does not make the legislation less unconstitutional," the Court held.

State school officials appealed to the Circuit Court, but on February 13, 1958, it affirmed the lower court's ruling, saying these two acts "were properly found to be unconstitutional."

The Supreme Court on October 13, 1958, denied Louisiana school officials review of the Circuit Court's ruling.

The courts in this manner eliminated another State device maintaining segregation in State colleges and universities, which already had been decisively outlawed.

CONCLUSION

Two decades of litigation have completely changed the southern pattern of higher education. During these years, the disparities in educational offerings to white and Negro citizens were revealed in all of their starkness by legal arguments in the courts. In 1938, students were rigidly segregated by law and educated according to their racial classification, with only one exception, Maryland. In 1958, legal differentiation by race is no longer valid.

Negro students now attend or may attend institutions formerly forbidden to them. White students are registered in institutions originally established for Negroes, where once such attendance would have been an impossibility.

Schools for Negroes formerly meagerly supported have felt the impact of changed conditions. Course offerings have been broadened and strengthened; increased appropriations have secured better prepared teachers and improved facilities; changed attitudes toward

them, their needs and their purposes have made them acquire new status in the field of education. A new university has been built in Texas as a result of court action, one college has been discontinued in Louisville, Kentucky, and several colleges have been elevated to university level. All of this has resulted from appeal to justice in the American courts.

While legal victories against segregated education have been phenomenal and such segregation as a national policy no longer exists, there are still States in which barriers must be removed by individual students who wish to profit by the law.

While legal decisions cannot change attitudes of those who still believe in and practice segregated education in spite of the law, they can provide the climate in which such attitudes can no longer be effective and in which more democratic ones may have an opportunity to develop. All but the most reactionary know that enforced segregation in tax-supported schools is a thing of the past, but they have yet to hear the judgment of the courts.

Mrs. Jessie P. Guzman is Director of the Department of Research and Records at Tuskegee Institute.

PROGRESS IN THE DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Guy B. Johnson

The transition from segregated to desegregated higher education in the South is a dramatic example of the possibilities of peaceful and rapid change in the structure of race relations. The story begins in 1935, when Donald Murray, a Negro student, sought and gained a court order for his admission to the law school of the University of Maryland. In 1938 the Supreme Court decision in the Gaines case established the principle that a state is obligated to furnish equality of educational opportunity "within its jurisdiction." This sounded the death-knell of the system of subsidies for "outside" training of Negro graduate and professional students and faced the Southern states with the choice of either building expensive separate facilities at this level or admitting Negroes to the existing state institutions for whites.

This legal advantage was not pursued vigorously until after World War II, and then there was litigation on a broad front. The upshot of the matter was that, beginning in 1948, there was a series of federal court decisions which opened one state university after another to Negro graduate and professional students. Thus by the time the Supreme Court declared in 1954 that compulsory segregation *per se* is unconstitutional, about 25 public institutions (and, voluntarily, a like number of church and private institutions) were already desegregated. The famous 1954 decision merely accelerated the pace and extended the applicability of desegregation to the undergraduate level.

Prior to 1948 only the University of Maryland, West Virginia University, and a mere handful of church-supported institutions had opened their doors to Negro students. Today more than half of all white public higher institutions in the South and nearly half of all institutions are desegregated. This paper will sketch briefly the major dimensions of this great change.

DESEGREGATED WHITE INSTITUTIONS

Perhaps the best measure of the quantitative extent of this "quiet revolution" is simply the ratio of integrated institutions to total institutions in the South. In Table I we see that 60% of all "white" public institutions, 41% of all church-supported institutions, 28% of the private and 45% of all institutions have been desegregated. Since it is the public universities and colleges which are vulnerable to litigation and court orders, it is to be expected that they would by now show a fairly high rate of integration. It is more

surprising to find that church and private schools, which are not affected by recent litigation, have integrated to a considerable extent. Here a moral conviction as to the wrongfulness of segregation, reinforced by some embarrassment at seeing public institutions make the plunge first, has caused a good deal of integration.

TABLE I
Desegregated White Institutions in the South by
Type of Control

<i>Control</i>	<i>Total No.</i>	<i>No. Desegregated</i>	<i>% Desegregated</i>
Public	206	123	60
Church	233	96	41
Private	114	32	28
Total	553	251	45

The extent of desegregation has some relation to geography and demography, of course. In Table II we have divided the South (i.e., the seventeen former "separate school" states plus the District of Columbia) into three zones or areas. The Border area accounts for 65% of the desegregated institutions, the Middle area for 30%, and the Deep South area for only 5%. This is roughly parallel

TABLE II
Percent Distribution of Desegregated White Institutions by
Sub-Areas in the South and Type of Control

<i>Area*</i>	<i>Percentage Distribution</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>Public</i>	<i>Church</i>	<i>Private</i>	
Border States	57	56	77	65
Middle States	38	36	23	30
Deep South	5	8	0	5
	100	100	100	100

* The areas are defined as follows:

Border: Del., Md., D. C., W. Va., Ky., Mo., Okla.

Middle: Va., N. C., Tenn., Ark., Tex.

Deep South: S. C., Ga., Fla., Ala., Miss., La.

to the situation with regard to public school desegregation, but there is an important difference. Whereas our six Deep South states plus Virginia have so far staved off any desegregation of their public schools, only four states (Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina) have no desegregation of their tax-supported higher institutions. One of these, the University of Alabama, is technically "open" even though its first Negro student, Miss Autherine Lucy, was forced out by a disgraceful mob episode; and there are now only two states, Mississippi and South Carolina, which have no white higher institutions of any sort desegregated.

It is worth noting that in several instances, white and Negro institutions have been combined. In Washington, Wilson Teachers College and Miner Teachers College have been combined to form the District of Columbia Teachers College. In Kentucky, Louisville College, a municipal college for Negroes, has been absorbed into the University of Louisville; and in Missouri a Negro institution, Stowe Teachers College, has been combined with Harris Teachers College. Although this process may be repeated in a few situations in the future, it is not likely to play a very important role in the total picture of integration.

DESEGREGATION IN REVERSE

The admission of Negroes to white institutions has attracted so much attention that the opposite trend has been obscured. For many years perhaps 20 to 25 of the nearly 100 Negro higher institutions in the South have quietly accepted an occasional white student, and one school, Howard University, has had a sizeable white enrollment. Since desegregation has become an established fact, and particularly after the 1954 Supreme Court decision, there is a tendency toward official desegregation policies in the Negro colleges, at least in the Border and Middle areas. For example, last year Kentucky State College enrolled more than 50 white students, Tennessee State enrolled two, and North Carolina A. & T. College enrolled one white student during the 1958 summer session.

The "big story" of desegregation in reverse, however, is the story of West Virginia State College. The college is located in an area which is expanding industrially and which has a growing white population interested in improving its managerial and technical training. When the state adopted a general policy of desegregation in 1954, the college began to accept white students in special and evening classes. The demand has avalanched to the point that there are now more than 1000 of each race enrolled, with whites having a slight edge numerically. Certain problems and anxieties have accompanied this rapid change, but they are being handled skillfully. It should be emphasized that this interesting situation is the only one of its kind which has developed and that it is not likely to be duplicated until the South has become much more accustomed to the idea of racial integration in general.

NEGRO ENROLLMENT

Another measure of the extent of desegregation is the number of Negro students enrolled in integrated institutions. Here we must

first emphasize the difficulty of getting accurate data. Some administrators will readily give out enrollment figures by race, departments, schools, etc., while others cite official policy against doing so. Many a Negro leader or journalist who has espoused the idea of "let's take the race labels off" has found unexpected support of the idea by admissions officers who, when asked how many Negroes are enrolled, delight in replying, "We are sorry we can't give you that information, because we don't keep track of the race of our students."

However, on the basis of a fair number of official figures and of fairly reliable estimates in other cases, we are able to arrive at some totals which are probably not far from the truth. The situation may be summarized as follows: The number of Negroes currently attending formerly white institutions is between 5000 and 6000, the number attending the consolidated schools referred to above is between 1200 and 1500, making a total of 6200 to 7500.

The ratio of Negro to total enrollment is, of course, quite small. Except in the consolidated situations, it rarely exceeds 1 or 2% of the total. In the Middle area, with the exception of Texas, Negro enrollment is typically rather low (say, from 1 to 50) and is increasing slowly. In the Border area, it is larger on the average, with some of the major state institutions having 100 to 300 Negro students. Institutions which operate summer schools often find that their Negro enrollment, particularly in the field of teacher training, is much higher than in the regular session.

ACCOMMODATIONS AND PRIVILEGES

There was some attempt at first, especially on the part of state universities which were ordered by the courts to admit Negroes, to segregate the Negro student in various ways, such as in the use of rest rooms, library tables, dining tables, and even classrooms. A lawsuit against the University of Oklahoma by its first Negro student brought out the clear unconstitutionality of such practices, and, happily, such discrimination is now almost unknown. There are, however, still some areas of restriction. Some of the institutions have not yet integrated Negro students into their dormitories, partly because administration is under pressure not to do it and partly because the Negro students, being often local residents or commuters, have not pushed the matter of campus accommodations. Likewise, some schools continue to withhold swimming pool privileges from their Negro students. Still further, the anxiety of administrators over

"social" contacts has led some of them to declare that no "mixed social affairs" will be allowed on the campus.

CAMPUS PARTICIPATION

Negro students participate freely in practically all campus affairs. They have won membership in various scholarship societies, and they have had many offices and honors bestowed upon them by student organizations, both academic and non-academic. Since they have entered on the undergraduate level only recently in most institutions, they have not yet played much part in athletics, but they are going out for the teams more and more, and in the next few years they will probably produce some outstanding players on the Southern teams. Their presence has already created some difficulties in game schedules with schools in the Deep South area where several states have passed laws prohibiting their schools from playing "mixed" teams, but there is a growing determination to use good athletic material regardless of race and a growing conviction that the Deep South colleges are soon going to be left with no one to schedule except one another.

As suggested earlier, there is an uneasiness about "social" contacts which has led to a certain amount of restriction, but the emergent norm in this realm seems to be: if the social affair is an official activity of the institution itself or is a regular activity of some campus organization to which Negro students belong, then there should be no restrictions. It is only in the intimate and private social world of dating, partying and "fraternizing" that interracial contacts have remained at almost zero. Here the traditional taboos are in full force. Both sides have recognized them and have behaved with such restraint that very few occasions for friction have arisen.

SOME PROBLEM AREAS

It is the Negro student who faces the biggest problems of adjustment in this new era of college desegregation. Three problems in particular are worthy of mention. First and foremost is the matter of academic adjustments. The majority of Negro students are handicapped by an inferior educational background as well as by other social and economic factors, and they are not able to compete with the white students on equal terms. Thus they have a somewhat larger rate of drop-outs and failures. Time after time in our interviews with Negro students, we found that they had very high anxiety about academic performance. We might add that professors, too, face a dilemma, and there is a real danger that a "sympathetic"

grading tendency will crystallize into a double standard of grading.

A second problem is the strain of day to day interpersonal contacts. Negro students differ, of course, in their definitions of their situation, but we are convinced that most of them carry a constant *malaise* which arises from the conflict between their desire to feel completely accepted and their awareness of the white people's touchiness on the question of "social equality."

A third problem of adjustment arises from the contrast between the relatively democratic campus and the hard facts of segregation in the off-campus community. Thus the Negro student feels that he is always changing gears as he crosses the Mason-Dixon line between campus and community. It is interesting, however, that around a great many of the campuses a certain amount of desegregation is appearing, so that Negro students are increasingly able to enter cafes, movies, bowling alleys, and the like.

CONCLUSION

The transition from complete segregation to a rather high degree of desegregation in Southern higher education has now been accomplished in all except a few of the states. Ninety-five per cent of this change has transpired in the past ten years. Despite repeated predictions of violence and bloodshed as school after school was faced with desegregation, there was not a single instance of serious friction until the unfortunate episode at the University of Alabama.

White and Negro students have quickly learned new patterns of interaction. Going to class together, eating in the same dining rooms, living in the same dormitories, sharing the same campus activities—all these are now quite taken for granted. Naturally there remain certain points of friction and anxiety as the process of making new adjustments proceeds, and the Negro students have some special problems of academic achievement, morale, and social status to cope with. The fact remains, however, that desegregation in the Southern institutions is well on the way and, considering its tender age, remarkably successful.

Note: The data on desegregation presented in this paper are taken from the author's survey, supplemented by newspaper reports and by the excellent state-by-state reports published monthly in *Southern School News*.

Guy B. Johnson is Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of North Carolina.

THE TAX-SUPPORTED COLLEGE FOR NEGROES

Frank A. DeCosta

INTRODUCTION

This article will be concerned with the relative progress which has taken place, since the Gaines vs Canada decision, in the tax-supported colleges for Negroes in the South. In the main, the aspects of progress will be limited to those aspects which may be objectively measured and for which sufficient and satisfactory data are available.

It seems that progress should be reviewed in the light of at least two factors: (1) the ratio of Negroes to the total comparable population within individual states and within the South; and (2) similar progress which has occurred among tax-supported colleges for whites within individual states and the South. To the writer, these two factors seem germane to any analysis of the status of tax-supported education for Negroes at any given period and to progress in the status between periods. Other investigators¹ have thought otherwise. Employing different *indexes of status* and different *indexes of progress*, they have, on the basis of data similar to those included in this investigation, arrived at different conclusions. The amount of space allotted to this discussion does not permit statistical tabular presentations.²

THE NUMBER AND LEVEL OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS

The tendency of a higher institution to enroll the largest per cent of its students from the community in which it is located and the practice of the state to establish different higher institutions at different locations within its boundaries suggest that the number and level of higher institutions, properly interpreted, may be used as a measure of the availability or status of higher education at any given period. In this connection, therefore, this section will be concerned with progress in the availability of higher education for Negroes of the South between 1938 and the present, as reflected by the number and level of higher institutions available to Negroes.

The total number of higher institutions attended predominantly by Negroes increased from thirty-three in 1938 to thirty-six in 1958; while the total number of higher institutions attended predominantly by whites increased from 188 in 1938 to 209 in 1958. Further, on the basis of the 1930 census figures, Negroes of the South were provided one higher institution for every 294,000 persons in its

¹ Note Eells, W. C. "Higher Education of Negroes in the United States." *Journal of Negro Education*, 24:426-34, Fall 1955.

² Supportive data in the form of complete state tables and individual data sheets for all institutions included in this discussion are in the writer's files.

population. In contrast, it may be deduced that one higher institution was provided for every 169,000 whites in the South. On the basis of 1950 population figures, it may be deduced that the situation in 1958 is, for Negroes, one higher institution for approximately every 296,000 Negroes in the population; and, for whites one higher institution for approximately every 194,000 whites in the population.

Although these figures suggest little relative change in the provisions of higher education among Negroes and whites of the South between 1938 and 1958, an additional fact needs to be considered. This fact is that, in 1958, fifty-seven per cent of the tax-supported higher institutions for whites in the South enrolled Negroes.³ This means, of course, that, in 1958, approximately 155 tax-supported higher institutions in the South were attended by Negroes. This is in marked contrast to 1938! On the other hand, caution should be used in interpreting this fact for Johnson⁴ estimates that, in 1958, only about 5,000 Negroes were enrolled in all of the predominantly white higher institutions of the South which had become desegregated (252 public, private, and denominational institutions).

This comparison with respect to the number of higher institutions provided permits at least three conclusions to be made: (1) The availability of tax-supported higher education to Negroes of the South has increased since 1938; (2) The availability of tax-supported higher education to whites of the South in 1958 is less than it was in 1938; and (3) Both in 1938 and 1958 higher education was considerably more available to whites of the South than to Negroes of the South.

It is interesting to deduce, in passing, that, in 1958, the relatively poor states of the South—Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina—provide one higher institution for every 136,000 white persons in their population; and one higher institution for every 429,000 Negroes in their population. The former statistic is above the average for the South; while the latter statistic is below the average for the South. Further, these are states in which no desegregation in tax-supported institutions has occurred.

With respect to progress in the level of higher education provided between 1938 and 1958, the change for Negroes was from nine junior colleges, twenty-three four-year colleges, and one graduate school in 1938 to three junior colleges, twenty-one four-year colleges, and *eleven* graduate schools in 1958. This change was characterized

³ Guy B. Johnson. "Desegregation and the Future of the Negro College: A Critical Summary." *Journal of Negro Education*, 27:430-435, Summer, 1958.

⁴ *Ibid.*

by junior colleges' becoming four-year colleges and four-year colleges' becoming graduate schools. Doubtless, some of this change may be attributed to normal evolutionary development. One may note the presence of it in the change which occurred among white institutions between 1938 and 1958. On the other hand, one should recognize the influence of the Gaines decision in the shift of Negro institutions from four-year colleges to graduate schools. Seven of these graduate schools were established within seven years after this decision.

Employing the highest level of education provided as a measure of level and relating this measure to the population; (1) the level of higher education for Negroes increased between 1938 and 1958; (2) the level of higher education for whites increased between 1938 and 1958; and (3) the level of higher education provided for Negroes in 1958 is only about one-third of that which was provided for whites in 1938.

ENROLLMENT

It may be observed that in Negro colleges between 1938 and 1955, the undergraduate enrollment increased from approximately 16,000 to 38,000 and the graduate enrollment increased from 10 to over 2,000. The undergraduate enrollment of the average Negro institution increased 2.2 times; while the undergraduate enrollment of the average institution for whites increased one and two-third times during this period.

The increase in the graduate enrollment from 10 in 1938 to approximately 2,200, in 1955, seems attributable to both normal enrollment growth and the relatively large increase in the number of graduate schools for Negroes.

Despite the notable increases which took place in the undergraduate and graduate enrollments in the colleges for Negroes of the South between 1938 and 1955, it seems significant to point out that the combined enrollments in 1955 represented only one person per 254,000 of the Negro population. In contrast, the combined enrollments in institutions for whites represented one person per 107,000 of the white population.

DEGREES CONFERRED

The number of degrees conferred by higher institutions for Negroes increased from 2,000 undergraduate and four graduate degrees in 1938 to 6,600 undergraduate and 1,000 graduate degrees in 1955. These increases may be attributed, in addition to normal institutional growth, to two factors already noted: (1) the change of institutions from junior college status to degree-granting status; and (2) the

relatively large increase in the number of institutions for Negroes which offer graduate work.

Percentage-wise, the increases in the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees conferred by institutions for Negroes between 1938 and 1955 were greater than the increases in institutions for whites. On the other hand, it seems significant to point out that the number of undergraduate degrees conferred by the average institution for Negroes in 1955 was less than the number conferred by the average institution for whites in 1938. In contrast, the number of graduate degrees conferred by the average institution for Negroes in 1955 was greater than the number conferred by the average institution for whites in 1938. This seems somewhat paradoxical!

Lest the preceding analysis be viewed too optimistically, it seems necessary to point out that, in the South in 1955: (1) institutions for Negroes awarded one degree for every 1,383,000 persons in the Negro population; and (2) institutions for whites awarded one degree for every 654,000 persons in the white population. The social and economic implications of this condition seem apparent.

THE LIBRARY: NUMBER OF VOLUMES AND ANNUAL EXPENDITURES

Improvements were made between 1938 and 1955 in the number of volumes housed and the annual expenditures made by the libraries in higher institutions for Negroes in the South. Briefly, for the average library the number of volumes increased from approximately 16,000 to approximately 37,500; and the annual expenditures for books and periodicals increased from approximately \$3,000 to approximately \$13,000. In this connection, it seems significant to observe that the average library in institutions for whites: (1) housed approximately 45,000 volumes in 1938; and (2) made an annual expenditure of approximately \$22,500 in 1955.

The preceding analysis indicates that the library of the average institution for Negroes is still a small library, despite the doubling of its holdings between 1938 and 1955. Further, the relatively lower annual expenditure for books and periodicals in institutions for Negroes suggests that the differential between the library holdings of institutions for whites and the library holdings of institutions for Negroes will be increased in the years ahead.

Implications—not too subtle—for the higher education of Negroes in the South are contained in the observations that, in 1955, the library of the University of Texas: (1) housed more volumes than the combined libraries of the thirty-two institutions for Negroes reported in Table II; and (2) expended for books and periodicals

more than half the amount expended by the thirty-one institutions for which data are reported. Further, the combined library holdings among higher institutions for whites in Alabama and Mississippi were approximately one and one-half times the combined library holdings of the thirty-two colleges for Negroes reported in Table II.

CURRENT INCOME AND VALUE OF PLANT

The current income of the average institution for Negroes rose from approximately \$372,000 to approximately \$1,147,000; while the value of the plant rose from approximately \$800,000 to approximately \$4,300,000. During the same period, the current income of the average institution for whites rose from approximately \$605,000 to approximately \$2,218,000; while the value of the plant rose from approximately \$2,200,000 to approximately \$7,700,000. These figures reveal, percentage-wise, that: (1) institutions for whites improved more in current income than did institutions for Negroes; and (2) institutions for Negroes improved more in the value of their plants than did institutions for whites. Of course, it seems that proper evaluation of the latter conclusion dictates the necessity of pointing out that: (1) in 1955, the value of the plant of the average institution for Negroes was only a little more than one-half of the value of the plant for the average institution for whites; and (2) due to the large number of institutions provided for whites, in 1955 the ratio of the value of the plants for whites to the value of the plants for Negroes was 10:1. The white-Negro population ratio was 4:1.

PREPARATION OF FACULTY

It seems to the writer that the quality of education available to students is related, partly, to the preparation of the faculty of institutions attended by the students. Further, it seems that an approximation of faculty-preparation may be made through analysis of the degrees which have been earned by the faculty. Such an analysis is the purpose of this section.

In 1938, the faculty of the average college for Negroes had earned approximately four doctorates; twenty-two master's degrees; and eleven bachelor's degrees. In 1955, the faculty of the average college for Negroes had earned fifteen doctorates; sixty-one master's degrees; and nine bachelor's degrees. Viewed from the standpoint of faculty-composition, the changes in these institutions between 1938 and 1955 were: (1) from 11 per cent doctorates to 18 per cent doctorates; (2) from 59 per cent master's degrees to 72 per cent master's degrees; and (3) from 30 per cent bachelor's degrees to 10 per cent bachelor's degrees.

A similar analysis for higher institutions among whites reveals the changes between 1938 and 1955 to be: (1) from 32 per cent doctorates to 37 per cent doctorates; (2) no changes in the percentage of master's degrees; and (3) from 17 per cent bachelor's degrees to 12 per cent bachelor's degrees.

The important aspects of this analysis seem to be: (1) the percentage increase in doctorates between 1938 and 1955 in the faculty of the average college for Negroes was not appreciably greater than the increase in the faculty of the average college for whites; and (2) in 1955, the ratio of percentage of doctorates in institutions for whites to the percentage of doctorates in institutions for Negroes was 2:1. Employing the highest earned degree as a measure of the relative quality of instruction in higher institutions, these figures suggest that the quality of instruction available to Negro college students in the South has been, and continues to be, poorer than the quality of instruction available to white college students of the South. The enormity of this problem has increased with the addition of graduate work in the colleges for Negroes.

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATIONS

The purpose of this chapter has been to determine the relative progress which has been made in the tax-supported colleges for Negroes since 1938. Included in the investigation were the tax-supported colleges in seventeen states and the District of Columbia, which at the time of the *Gaines vs Canada* decision, required, by law, racial segregation in education.

The investigation was limited to eight aspects of status or availability which could be objectively measured and for which sufficient and satisfactory data were available. The aspects of status are: (1) Number and Level of Higher Institutions, (2) Enrollment, (3) Degrees Conferred, (4) Number of Volumes in Library, (5) Annual Library Expenditures, (6) Current Income, (7) Value of Plant, and (8) Preparation of Faculty.

In assessing the relative progress which was made by the colleges for Negroes, two techniques were employed: (1) the changes which occurred on the eight measures since 1938 in the colleges for Negroes were noted; and (2) these changes were compared with similar changes which occurred during the same period among colleges for whites.

The summary of findings lists those which seem most significant.

First, on the basis of the eight quantitative measures which were employed as aspects of educational status, both the tax-supported colleges for Negroes and the tax-supported colleges for whites in

the South have shown continuous progress since 1938. Of course, the amount of progress varied significantly among the states and among institutions within each state.

Second, percentage-wise, the progress of the colleges for Negroes has been greater than the progress of the colleges for whites on practically all of the measures employed in this investigation. The writer, however, questions this statistic as a realistic measure of progress. Percentage-increases are meaningless for comparison when there are extreme variations in the initial points from which the increase is measured.

Stated positively, the writer is convinced that the status or availability of higher education is a necessary—although not a sufficient—function of the measures employed in this investigation. Thus, to him, it seems much more realistic to measure progress in terms of absolute differences rather than in terms of percentage-increases. If one institution adds 100 volumes to its library while a second adds 50 volumes to its library, does it not sound almost facetious to state that the second institution made more progress? It certainly is meaningless as far as the improvement of education is concerned.

Third, despite the notable progress which has been made among colleges for Negroes since 1938, the wide differentials which persisted, in 1955, between the colleges for Negroes and the colleges for whites are appalling. Although the population ratio of whites to Negroes in the South was 4:1, the following approximate ratios with respect to the status of higher education existed: (1) Number of higher institutions available, 6:1; (2) Enrollment, 9:1; (3) Degrees conferred, 8:1; (4) Library volumes, 18:1; (5) Library expenditures, 11:1; (6) Current income, 11:1; (7) Value of buildings and grounds, 10:1; and (8) Preparation of faculty, 16:1.

It seems sufficiently significant to point out that the ratios are larger than these in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina. These are the states in which no desegregation of tax-supported colleges has occurred.

The obvious consequences of this situation to the South, in general, to Negroes of the South, and to tax-supported colleges attended predominantly by Negroes should be quite disturbing.

Finally, one must conclude that, on the basis of the data of this investigation, the separate-but-equal thesis in higher education is untenable. This modest investigation, therefore, merely supplements the numerous investigations which have found this thesis to be invalid.

Frank A. DeCosta is Professor of Education at Morgan State College.

PRIVATE NEGRO COLLEGES SINCE THE GAINES DECISION

W. J. Trent, Jr.

When Mr. Chief Justice Hughes read the decisions of the Supreme Court in the case of *Gaines vs Canada Ex Rel Missouri* in 1938 he not only faced the Court in the proper direction but he also let loose forces in American education that have had wide influence over the past twenty years. The Court was saying that a sovereign state had the responsibility to provide comparable education within the borders for all of its citizens. True the Court did not rule out the possibility of doing this on a separate basis but it did begin to spell out that this was not merely quantitative but also qualitative. The next step was logical and it came not too many years later—qualitative education in order to be equal must be identical. But in 1938 the Court did not say this. It did, however, place the burden for equal educational opportunities on the shoulder of the state and they began to move in the direction of strengthening their public institutions of higher learning for Negroes.

We are concerned here with the effect of the Gaines Decision on the private colleges for Negro youth and what has happened to them in the twenty years since that momentous decision. The effect on these colleges was indirect but nevertheless powerful. The southern and border states began to take more seriously the need for more adequate financing of their public colleges and teacher training institutions. They not only appropriated more funds for the general educational program but also established new graduate and professional schools. It is clear that the purpose of this new concern was in the main to avoid admitting Negroes to the then white colleges and professional schools. But whatever the reason, the Negro public colleges began to grow and develop at a rapid rate. New plants were built—new curricula developed—faculty salary levels were improved, et cetera.

Since in a wide area of their programs (teacher training) the public and private colleges competed for students, this development of the state school created pressure on the private college to improve its offerings—to strengthen its faculty and somehow to find money for better plant. The private colleges just prior to 1938 were educating about 54 per cent of all Negroes who attended Negro colleges and if they were not to decline too much in importance, they would need to do some serious thinking about their situations. Very few of them had significant endowments. The supporting church boards (of the church-related colleges) did not seem to be aware of the cost of supporting a first-rate college for Negro youth. Private phi-

lanthropy, once the source of major support for many of the private colleges, had been steadily going down hill; and fees could not be increased. The economic circumstances were not fortuitous at this time with respect to the private colleges. It is important of course to remember that the economic situation represented only a phase of the problem. There were many and compelling reasons why students would still choose a church related private college as against a state college but unless these private colleges were bulwarked with a well-trained faculty, adequate plant and some forceful exposition of the basic philosophy of the institution, it was clear that these colleges would decline in usefulness and importance.

During the ensuing twenty years many other forces have been at work on the educational scene. Before getting into the matter of what the private colleges have done over the years to meet the challenge posed by the Gaines Decision, it will be well to touch on two additional developments or events that have vitally affected these institutions. Whatever has happened during the years since 1938 it is safe to say that as a result of the Gaines Decision the Negro colleges, both private and public, began to move more rapidly into the main stream of higher education in America. Prior to this Negro colleges, in the main, were on the sidelines, operating under the "protection" of segregation laws and thus being spared the buffeting of the forces in the competitive educational scene. These Negro colleges competed only with one another and were even accorded special consideration by the accrediting agency in their region.

ACCREDITATION

This discussion of the development of regional accreditation for Negro colleges is entirely concerned with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for this is the agency with jurisdiction over the area in which the great majority of Negro colleges are located. Up until 1930 this organization would not consider accrediting the Negro colleges in the region despite repeated requests from the officials of these colleges. Neither would they consider admitting these colleges to membership under any circumstance. The Negro colleges then organized their own association for mutual helpfulness in academic development. In 1930 the attitude of the officials of the Southern Association began to change and a special committee to review and accredit the Negro colleges was organized under the direction of J. Henry Highsmith, Director of Certification, State Department of Education of North Carolina, and President Theodore Jack, of Randolph Macon College. It was clear from the beginning

that this committee had compassion with respect to these struggling colleges and did not plan to measure them by the standards set for the white institutions in the region. This attitude called forth a mixed reaction on the part of the Negro college officials. Some were forthright in their condemnation of the double standard, while others were pleased that this first step had been taken. Whatever the present circumstances surrounding standards, these latter concluded that this interim step was best since many of these Negro colleges had so far to come in order to measure up completely.

During this period these colleges were still looked upon as "institutions apart" and were so treated. A small group of the presidents of the Negro colleges during the 1940's and early 1950's persisted in their efforts to have nothing less than full membership in the association and accreditation by common standards. This was discussed at most of the annual meetings of the Association of Negro Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Finally in 1954, the Southern Association agreed to a plan whereby the Negro colleges would be studied and accredited in a common standard with full membership the ultimate outcome by a certain date. The General Education Board made a grant to permit study of all of the Negro colleges prior to their consideration for full accreditation. This was done for the purpose of pointing out the weaknesses of these institutions with the hope that they might be rapidly remedied. In 1956 at its Dallas meeting, the Southern Association voted to extend membership privileges to eligible Negro colleges the following year.

For the present there are four categories into which these colleges fall, and the distribution of the private Negro colleges is as follows:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Private Colleges</i>
Full Membership	29	19
Fully accredited	4	3
Not meeting one or more standards	15	8
On probation	8	6
	<hr/> 56	<hr/> 36

A review of the major weaknesses in the private Negro colleges disclosed the following:

1. Inadequate endowment
2. Inadequate financial outlay per student
3. Inadequate faculty salaries
4. Inadequate expenditures on libraries

In other words, these colleges needed more money.

Thus, to the pressure exerted by the new competition engendered by the Gaines Decision were added the pressures of the new accrediting procedure. This latter, too, was another step in the direction of moving the Negro colleges faster into the mainstream of American education. But the giant stride in this direction came with the pronouncement of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954 that segregation in public education was declared unconstitutional.

SUPREME COURT DECISION, 1954

This momentous decision can and will be discussed down through the years in terms of its influence in many directions. Our attention in this paper is directed toward the immediate and long-range effect on the private Negro colleges. Immediately after the 1954 decision, the United Negro College Fund (an organization composed of the majority of the private, accredited Negro colleges) issued a statement of policy. Some of the excerpts follow:

For an indefinite period, the major responsibility for higher education of Negroes in the South will continue to fall upon the colleges that have been serving them for the past 100 years. . . . It is the Fund's hope that in the near future the facilities and faculties of these colleges which have been strengthened through funds received from the United Negro College Fund will be used for the development of human resources without respect to color, creed or race.

The Fund's member institutions will continue—not as colleges limiting their services to Negro students, but as *first-class institutions* for *all* qualified American youth.

The number of high school graduates seeking higher education in the South is greater than ever before in history. Experts predict that by 1970 college enrollment will be doubled. Not only will every good college now in existence be needed, but present facilities will have to be expanded and new colleges built to meet this upward pressure. The Fund's member colleges, as fully accredited, class "A" institutions form an integral part of our whole network of privately endowed colleges and universities.

The decision imposes greater responsibility upon the colleges to maintain their standards of excellence and to expand their educational programs to meet the constantly growing demands for first-class educational opportunities by the youth of the South. Operating expenses can be expected to increase proportionately.

This statement had been in preparation for several years when it became more apparent with the passing of each year that the Supreme Court had to make the decision that it did. The train of events and prior discussions all pointed in this direction. There were many reasons for making this pronouncement.

First, under the dramatic impact of the decision, protagonists and antagonists forgot about social evolution or revolution and began talking and thinking in absolutes. Some individuals concluded that since the Court had spoken it had "ipso facto" opened doors to all public schools to all races and there was no further need for so-called "Negro schools and colleges." Those who would preserve segregation, if at all possible in higher education, began to reason that if we pour money into the public colleges for Negroes we can relieve the pressure to attend the white public colleges. Both of these were wrong. America would need all of its accredited efficiently managed educational institutions to meet the demand for higher education. Also the American Negro would exercise his right to apply to erstwhile white public colleges regardless of what the state did about their public colleges for Negro youth.

The effect of the 1954 decision on the private Negro college was direct. It had formerly been competing with Negro public institutions for students and faculty and resources. In the immediate future this would continue to be true but in the long run they realized that in order to make their fullest and best contribution to American education they would have to compete with all other institutions in the state or region in which they were located. They realized that they could no longer restrict their enrollment to Negro students and that Negro students now had a wider choice of places to go to college.

PART II

In 1938 the private Negro colleges were educating approximately 54 per cent of all Negroes attending predominantly Negro colleges. The average enrollment was a little in excess of 600 students which was about 60 per cent of the average enrollment of the public institutions. According to studies by D. O. W. Holmes, Thomas Jesse Jones and others, the resources were for the most part inadequate. While the private colleges talked about their size as an asset (more personal attention for the student, et cetera) the fact was that the size merely reflected more often than not inadequate resources rather than excellence of program or selectivity of students. Even before the pressures that started building in 1938, authorities in this field were calling upon the private Negro colleges to re-define their ob-

jectives, improve their standards and work assiduously toward developing better and firmer financial support. Many things have happened to these colleges during the past twenty years. This article, however, will deal only with two or three decisive moves which the private colleges made in order to continue their distinctive service. and work assiduously toward developing better and firmer financial support. Many things have happened to these colleges during the past twenty years. This article, however, will deal only with two or three decisive moves which the private colleges made in order to continue their distinctive service.

MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATIONS

A systematic analysis of the geographic locations of the private colleges indicated that one way to strengthen the corps of Negro private colleges to meet the new challenges would be through merger. In the early 30's two such mergers and affiliations had taken place (New Orleans University and Straight College merged to become Dillard University; and the Atlanta University-Morehouse-Spelman affiliation). However while economies and educational efficiency might dictate certain mergers or affiliations, the stumbling block was usually the denominational pride and loyalties. A dramatic case in point even now is the situation where two colleges are across the street from one another—both of which would obviously benefit by an affiliation of some sort—but who are supported by two different denominations. Educational efficiency thus has to give way to denominational requirements.

In many instances this problem has been worked through. Two colleges in Austin, Texas—Samuel Huston College, a Methodist college, and Tillotson College, an American Missionary Association supported institution merged in 1952 to become Huston Tillotson College. In 1947 the Atlanta School of Social Work ceased to be an independent institution and became the Social Work School of Atlanta University. The AMA college in Mississippi—Tougaloo—was merged with Southern Christian College, an institution supported by the Christian Church and became Tougaloo Southern Christian College in 1954. The latest merger or affiliation has to do with theological seminaries. Too often the seminaries associated with the private Negro colleges have been inadequately supported and have had a difficult time achieving accreditation. With the aid of the Sealantic Foundation, an agency financed by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Gammon Theological Seminary and the seminaries of Morehouse College (Baptist), Morris Brown College (AME) and Lane College (CME)

have joined to become the Interdenominational Theological Seminary. Other seminaries have been invited to come into the organization and it is reasonable to assume that several others will join this obviously sensible movement.

Thus the number of private colleges has been reduced since 1938 but their reduction has not been caused by the closing of their doors (with one exception—Storer College of Harpers Ferry, West Virginia) but by mergers and affiliations. These institutions are better able to measure up to the exacting standards of excellence now being required.

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND

In 1943 a group of presidents of private Negro colleges was called together by Dr. F. D. Patterson, the then president of Tuskegee Institute, to discuss the possibility of establishing a cooperative fund raising organization for the private accredited Negro colleges.

In 1944, financed jointly by the Julius Rosenwald Fund, the General Education Board, and the member colleges themselves, the first campaign of the United Negro College Fund was launched in several major cities across the country. All of the accredited private Negro colleges were invited to join the Fund and twenty-seven of the thirty-four became members. Two declined the invitation and five joined in the following year. Even though the goal of \$1,000,000 was not reached in the first campaign (\$765,000 having been raised), the colleges deemed the campaign successful from their point of view because they received that first year from two and one-half to three times as much as they had in their best years from private philanthropy. The funds were divided on the basis of a formula developed and approved by the presidents themselves.

In the fifteen years since the United Negro College Fund was started some \$20,000,000 have been raised for current purposes ranging from \$765,562 in 1944 to \$1,850,000 in 1958.

All told, the United Negro College Fund raised over thirty-seven and three-quarter million dollars to strengthen the educational programs of its member institutions. An official of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools commented on several occasions that some of the best invested money in higher education was that raised for its member colleges by the UNCF campaign.

While the UNCF was thus helping to solve the financial problems of a group of private Negro colleges it at the same time was pioneering in new fields of educational financing. There are three firsts in the Fund's history:

The United Negro College Fund was the first continuing co-

operative fund raising venture in higher education. There had been one or two joint ventures for special purposes but they performed their short range function and disappeared. (Hampton-Tuskegee Endowment Campaign, as an example.)

The United Negro College Fund is the first organization to ask for and secure contributions from the general public for higher education. Aside from alumni, persons of average and small means have not made contributions directly to colleges; they of course have contributed through their churches as a Christian duty. The "man-in-the-street" gives to UNCF.

Already the cooperative pattern has been followed by some 38 college groups in America. These organizations seek primarily corporate gifts. In the past several years corporate giving has become a major factor in financing higher education in America.

One last word about the Fund's contribution to the stability of finances of its member colleges. Within recent years the Fund has received several sizeable legacies. These monies have been placed in a reserve and invested. The income helps defray campaign costs and in case of emergency the reserve can be made available to the member colleges under certain circumstances.

CONCLUSION

In 1958 the private Negro colleges are educating approximately 42% of all Negroes attending predominantly Negro colleges. This is a decrease of 12% in twenty years (54% as against 42%). On the whole it is to be anticipated that the public institutions will continue to provide educational opportunity for the largest number of Negro students. This is in the nature of the function and philosophy of the educational program of state supported colleges. Because of the events of the past twenty years and their impact on private colleges, and because of the steps that the colleges have taken to strengthen their programs, this proportion of students who attend private colleges is more nearly a product of careful choice than of inadequate resources. In 1938 the proportion was small because the facilities were inadequate. In 1958 the proportion is small because of a carefully developed policy of selectivity (within limits).

Now these private institutions are an integral part of the educational system of America and as such they will be called upon to carry their full share of the educational load. Their role will change with the years and they will be the stronger because of what has happened to them during these past eventful twenty years.

W. J. Trent, Jr. is Executive Director of the United Negro College Fund.

THE DESEGREGATED ALL-WHITE INSTITUTION . . . THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

William E. Bittle

No one may reasonably expect that desegregation and integration will proceed without incident in any previously segregated context. One may expect, however, that to the extent that formal, institutional factors favor both desegregation and integration, and to the extent that an ethos of racial equality is generated by such factors, to this extent both processes of adjustment will be made less difficult.

Oklahoma is, in many respects, a state well-disposed to desegregation. It cannot qualify as a typical southern state, having neither historically, nor culturally, significant and intimate ties with the "hard-core" South.

Though it is true that many of Oklahoma's residents are of southern origin, it is equally true that large areas of the central and western parts of the state are peopled by persons of plains background. In general, the state has tended to lack the elaborate, emotionally entrenched notions of racial difference which characterize other parts of the South.

In addition, the Negro population of the state is relatively small, and there are many areas of the state literally without Negro residents. This is perhaps a second fact which contributes to the lenient racial attitude of many Oklahomans.

It is fortunate, then, and perhaps the determinist might argue no accident, that Oklahoma provided the background for several important decisions relative to desegregation. Although these decisions are generally known, it may be useful to briefly consider them as a guide to desegregation at the University of Oklahoma.

From the time of statehood, Oklahoma has maintained separate schools for Negro and white students. Constitutionally required, and buttressed by statutes providing penalties for conducting, teaching in or attending mixed schools, segregation was a well-established part of the state's public education policy.

It was not until 1946, though, that a serious attack upon the segregation laws was attempted. In this year, Ada Lois Sipuel, a Negro citizen of the state, brought action in mandamus against the Board of Regents of the University, demanding that they be compelled to admit her as a qualified student to the state-supported law school at Norman. A district court in Cleveland County denied the suit, and Miss Sipuel followed through with an appeal to the State Supreme Court. The latter body heard the appeal, and finally affirmed

the district court's denial of the mandamus action. Miss Sipuel, the high court held, had not made known her intent to study law in the state in sufficient advance of the beginning of the school year to permit state officials to establish a separate law school for Negroes. The state court did not find, as Miss Sipuel's attorneys had asserted, that the case came within the rule of *Missouri ex rel. Gaines vs. Canada*, and the State of Oklahoma refused relief.

Miss Sipuel then took the case to the United States Supreme Court, and on January 12, 1948, the state court's decision was reversed, and the appellant's cause was remanded to the lower court for proceedings in consonance with the decision. This directive was ultimately complied with, and a separate, hastily constructed "law-school" was established in the State Capitol building, some twenty miles from the Norman campus. Separate education was still a basic doctrine in Oklahoma.

During subsequent litigation initiated by Miss Sipuel, the focus of interest moved to another series of suits, in many respects of greater significance for the cause of desegregation in higher education in the United States than any other cases to that time. In this latter litigation, the doctrine of separate but equal was broken for higher institutions, and the way paved in a very real sense for the general ruling of the Supreme Court in May of 1954.

During the enrollment period of the second semester of 1947-48, G. W. McLaurin, another Negro citizen of the state, applied for admission to the Graduate College of the University, proposing to begin a program of study leading to the doctor's degree in education. Taking his cue from the previous State Supreme Court ruling in the Sipuel case, McLaurin notified University authorities well in advance of his attempted enrollment. He was, nevertheless, denied admission to the University of Oklahoma on February 2, 1948, solely upon the basis of his race. He immediately appealed the case to the United States District Court in Oklahoma City, and on October 6, 1948, was granted relief, the District Court ordering his admission to the University in the program of his choice.

The Oklahoma legislature, faced with a ruling rendering the bulk of the state's statutes on separate education unconstitutional and unenforceable, passed emergency legislation, amending such statutes to allow for the education of Negro and white students in certain schools and under specific conditions, such conditions, in the main, stating that instruction of members of the several races should be accomplished at different times and different places. These amendments were hastily signed by the Governor, and put into effect.

When McLaurin met his classes, he found himself assigned a separate section of the room which had been designated for Negro students; when he used the University library, he was obliged to sit at a special table for Negroes; when he ate in the cafeteria, he took his lunch in advance of other students, and sat at a segregated table.

McLaurin again sought relief in the District Court. The appellant's counsel, in arguing the case, alleged that the isolation of McLaurin from his classmates was *prima facie* evidence of educational inequality. Such isolation, he said, "creates a mental discomfiture which makes concentration and study difficult, if not impossible. . . ." It places upon the plaintiff ". . . a badge of inferiority which affects his relationships, both to his fellow students and to his professors."¹

The Court could not agree, and refused relief, stating that it would not take as its prerogative the obliteration of the social or racial distinctions which a state had traditionally recognized as a basis for the classification of individuals for educational purposes, except to the extent that such distinctions deprived an individual of his federal rights. The latter, the Court held, was not the case in this instance.

McLaurin then made his well-known appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and on June 5, 1950, that body reversed the decision of the lower court, holding that the enforced segregation of McLaurin violated his rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, and ordered the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to treat the appellant in the fashion it treated students of all other races.

Separate education was no longer equal in higher education in Oklahoma. Although the state had earlier specified, in probable anticipation of a sequence of events following the decisions in the Sipuel cases, that Negro students would be admitted to the University only when they elected courses of study not offered at Langston University (the state's Negro institution), and though permission for entrance was demanded in writing from the State Regents for Higher Education, the precise and exact implementation of these laws was clearly a local University matter. Once a Negro student had been admitted to the University to study a course in pharmacy (a field not offered at Langston), he might shift at his will to another course of study, despite the fact that the latter course might be available to him at Langston. If no issue was made of this change of program, the student remained in residence at the University in essential violation of the state's provisions.

¹ 87 Fed. Suppl. 528.

For a number of years, then, between 1950 and the Supreme Court's decisions in 1954 and 1955, the University of Oklahoma admitted and instructed a limited number of Negro students under the provisions of those assorted statutes which had been adopted by the state. During this time, problems of "integration" were few. The number of students was extremely small, and the bulk of them commuted from Oklahoma City, posing no unique problems or difficulties for the University in terms of housing and eating facilities. It is estimated, for example, that the number of Negro students admitted between 1951 and 1954 was less than twenty. Some students elected to live on campus, and they were provided with dormitory facilities without incident.

Reporting on September 3, 1954, the *Southern School News* noted that NAACP officials in Oklahoma City had been watching the treatment of the few Negro undergraduates quietly admitted to the University of Oklahoma, and reported no slights or difficulties on the campus.²

Following the 1954 decision, the State Regents took no additional action, but held to their policy of admitting only Negro students seeking work in specialized fields.

On May 31, 1955, of course, the Supreme Court ordered the District Courts affected to take such proceedings "and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases."³

Dr. M. A. Nash, chancellor for the State Regents, asked the Attorney General for a ruling on what the new decision would mean to the state colleges. Acting on advice that the ruling would affect colleges and universities in the same fashion it would affect the lower schools, the State Regents, on June 6, 1955, voted to open all state-supported institutions for higher education to any qualified undergraduate on a racially non-discriminatory basis. Dr. George L. Cross, president of the University of Oklahoma, ordered that institution opened to Negroes at once, without awaiting the September deadline set by the Regents. Desegregation at the University had been accomplished.

Although the exact factors which underlie a relatively smooth and uncomplicated desegregation process may be subtle in the extreme, one can, with at least a degree of certainty, deal with the

² *Southern School News*, Sept. 3, 1954.

³ *Southern School News*, June 8, 1955.

major institutional factors involved and document the events of desegregation in a fashion which is both systematic and meaningful. The task is not so easy when dealing with problems of integration, however. Data are often very difficult to obtain. Given an ethic of racial equalitarianism (which one may argue prevails at the University of Oklahoma), there is a strong tendency to minimize or ignore difficulties adjunct to integration, and to dismiss occasional reports of discrimination as instances of random, idiosyncratic behavior which might be expected on any campus, and which are not significantly related to Oklahoma's particular situation.

It seems most reasonable, then, in attempting to provide some indication of the degree to which integration has been achieved on the University campus, to deal principally with the official policy of the University, and to assume that such policy is implemented in all cases. Impressionistic statements of contrary tendencies are included in the interests of completeness, though their absolute validity cannot be guaranteed.

Academically, Negro students compete favorably with non-Negro students, and respond in as successful a fashion as do others. It might well have been anticipated, recognizing the differences in the quality of Negro primary and secondary education in many parts of segregated Oklahoma, that the entering Negro freshman would begin his career at the University with severe handicaps relative to preparation. It is reliably reported, however, that this is not the case, and that the drop-out rate for Negroes is proportionately lower than it is for the white students.

The attitude of the faculty toward integration varies, of course. It would be difficult to find any institution with a uniformly unprejudiced faculty. On a pure probability basis, one may assume that there are faculty members at the University who cannot themselves accept the proposition of racial equality, and would hold that desegregation has been an unfortunate error. The relevant fact, however, is not that such individuals teach on the faculty, but the extent to which it can be shown that their individual views bias them on the level of their academic relationship with Negro students.

Though evidence of this type is admittedly hard to develop, there is, at present, no indication that any Negro student has encountered discrimination in class at the hands of an instructor to the extent that his work or his grade in the course was affected. If differential treatment is accorded the Negro student, such treatment is on a level more subtle than outright discriminatory practices in the classroom. It should be remembered that a majority of the members

of the faculty are strongly in support of integration, and that considerable pressure exists to accomplish such integration in the smoothest possible fashion. There is some evidence, for example, that some members of the faculty have accorded Negroes preferential treatment, of perfectly legitimate sorts, on the theory that their adjustment problems are more acute than those of other students. In general, however, it is probably true that Negro students are dealt with in non-differential fashions.

All students, with certain categorical exceptions, are obliged to live in University housing if they remain in Norman. Such housing is, for the most part, in dormitories, though there are some units for married students. Housing is assigned to students on a time-priority basis. Thus, those students who apply earliest are given housing assignments which, according to the student ethic, are "superior" assignments. In terms of absolute physical conditions, the accommodations are all essentially similar, though some social differences, based upon relationship to the campus, direction in which the dormitory faces, and so forth, have developed. Negro students are assigned on exactly the same basis as are other students. It is repeatedly pointed out by administrators, however, that Negroes in the main tend to apply for enrollment, and necessarily for housing accommodations, at somewhat later dates than do non-Negro students. As a result of this fact, their specified choice of dormitories cannot always be honored, and they are therefore assigned to dormitories (or sections thereof) which have "lower" social priority in terms of the ephemeral, student-imputed factors noted above. Over the past few semesters, it appears that there has tended to be a concentration of Negro students in certain of these "low" priority areas, and students have come to identify such areas as essentially Negro areas. From the point of view of the University, nothing could be in greater apparent violation of its attitudes and steps are currently being proposed which will provide a more random distribution of Negro students throughout all University housing, even in temporary violation of the "first-come-first-served" rule.

Those Negro students living in University housing utilize, without any restriction, all of the facilities of such housing: they eat in the cafeterias, congregate socially in the lounges, and move about with complete freedom. There is some tendency, though, for Negro students to eat at tables by themselves in the cafeteria, and to routinely congregate in particular sections of the house lounges. Evidence of systematic discrimination by other students, impelling such self-imposed segregation, is lacking. But this is an area of behavior, quite clearly, in which it is most difficult to evaluate the choice of

Negro students to eat and socialize by themselves as "voluntary segregation," on the one hand, or as acute apprehension at attempted integration, on the other. Though certain non-Negro students have dramatically risen and vacated a table when Negro students joined the group, it is generally agreed that such instances are isolated, and that well-developed avoidance patterns have not manifested themselves in the dormitories.

Another area of critical importance for the successful integration of the Negro student is employment. Many individuals remain at the University only so long as they are able to contribute to their own support. The University maintains an employment service for students, and provides, on a completely non-discriminatory basis, information on positions available both on campus and in the town of Norman. It is reported by the service that no substantiated instances of discrimination are known, though members of the service grant that it is more difficult to place Negro students than white students with equal qualifications. One possible factor contributing to this fact is that many Negro students seek employment in which they can earn their board. Such positions are, for the most part, limited to the Greek houses on the campus, and a large number of such houses will not hire Negro students as waiters.

The Negro graduate student is in a somewhat better position than the undergraduate, since the department in which he works often is able to provide him with assistance. At least one department has hired a Negro woman as secretary, and several additional Negroes are employed in clerical positions on the campus.

The Negro student encounters considerable difficulty in attempting to find employment off-campus. Norman, traditionally a lily-white town, affords few opportunities for Negro employment except in menial and poorly paying jobs, most of which make time demands of greater magnitude than the student can afford. Employment opportunities in general, then, are poorer for Negroes than for whites, though where University-controlled employment is concerned, the same general policy of non-discrimination is applied. Once again, it is in that realm of activity outside the sphere of control of the University that difficulties arise.

The area of participation in University social activities poses fairly grave difficulties for the Negro student. House dances, and other activities of this type, are frequently attended by Negro students, and though such attendance is encouraged, there is the impossible difficulty which each Negro must face in an inability to detect in any precise manner the extent to which his total participation is expected, or more bluntly put, would be permitted. Inci-

dents related to dances have been reported, though it seems these are isolated. Negro students apparently attend such affairs only in small all-Negro groups, or simply fail to attend at all.

At the present time, there are fewer than fifty Negroes enrolled on the campus. They constitute, then, a very small group, with limited potential for an organization which would provide them with the same social outlets that are provided others. Negro students are not admitted to sororities and fraternities at the University of Oklahoma, and no Negro Greek organization has yet been established. Short of total integration into University social activity, which goal is certainly sought by all responsible persons on the campus, the Negro is likely to remain socially isolated for some years.

It would be fitting to summarize with a statement of those factors which have made both desegregation and integration relatively smooth at the University of Oklahoma. It is impossible, however, to specify such factors in a fashion more detailed than has already been done. Certainly, the somewhat marginal position of the state relative to the hard-core south has been important. The tenure, during the litigations and after the Supreme Court decisions, of governors who, though committed to a course of segregated education under Oklahoma law, were not prepared to make political capital out of desegregation, was another factor.

But it may well have been Dr. George Cross and the administrative personnel of the institution he headed which were critical. Though conforming to the state laws during the Sipuel and McLaurin cases, and following the segregationist dictates of those laws, Dr. Cross immediately effected desegregation once the way was clear, and took seriously the dictates of a "prompt and reasonable start" and "all deliberate speed" which the Supreme Court handed down. The University was hospitable to desegregation, and the direct, but unflamboyant attitude of the administration was certainly conducive to the relative ease with which it was accomplished.

But all of these factors might well have been present in any environment in which desegregation was attempted, and might have contributed little or nothing to the type of transition accomplished at Oklahoma. It seems that the unfortunate fact remains that we are in no position at the moment to recognize those factors which produce smooth or violent reactions to desegregation, and cannot, therefore, make valid predictions of any sort. It is, then, unlikely that Oklahoma's example will serve as useful to other institutions, though one might hope that this conclusion is in error.

William E. Bittle is Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Oklahoma.

A REVERSE PATTERN OF INTEGRATION

Elaine M. Aber

From the time of its establishment in 1866 to September 1954, Lincoln University, a state institution of higher learning in Jefferson City, Missouri, operated as a segregated school for Negroes. When in 1954 the Supreme Court handed down its anti-segregation decision, Negro students began entering the previously white colleges over the state. Stowe Teachers College in St. Louis, the Negro counterpart of Harris Teachers College in the same city, was closed, and its students and some faculty members were integrated on the Harris campus, while the continuance of Lincoln University was debated in high places. The location of the University of Missouri only thirty miles away gave weight to the argument that Lincoln was no longer necessary. However, after considerable investigation the state legislature decided to retain the university and the future of the institution now seems secure.

Indeed, in the Fall of 1954, white students began registering at Lincoln, and they have increased in number steadily since that date. More and more local people are taking advantage of this opportunity for a college education at home. This year, the small junior college, operated as a part of the Jefferson City Public School system, was closed for the reason that it duplicated facilities available at Lincoln.

The university attracts students not only from the city but also from surrounding communities, some as far as sixty and seventy miles away. Its program has been partly altered to accommodate teachers in the area who desire late afternoon and night courses. Many other mature persons enroll as part-time students. A considerable number of women are completing educational requirements toward degrees which will enable them to teach. Some business and professional people come to the campus for special courses. For example, during the second semester of 1958 there were four local physicians enrolled. It was the writer's interest in the attitudes and problems of adjustment of white students in this reversed pattern of racial integration which led to this study. It is a truly unique situation since only one other college in the United States, West Virginia State College, has a comparable situation.

THE PROBLEM

There are no official statistics on the racial composition of the student body because the university records are not kept by race. It seems clear, however, that during the summer sessions, with the influx of teachers from the surrounding area and the reduction of

regular students, whites outnumber Negroes on the campus. During the regular sessions the Negroes are still in the majority. The writer's estimate for the spring of 1958, the time of this study, is that white students constitute between three hundred fifty and four hundred of a total enrollment of 1,029. The faculty is also predominantly Negro, with about ten percent being white.

In this unique relationship the onus of adjustment is largely upon the white student. This is not meant to imply that there are no pressures for change on the Negro student, but rather that the primary burden of accommodation has shifted to the white student. The Negro students are in the established position; they are the hosts. They still occupy the dormitories almost exclusively and campus activities are in their control. For the first time in his life the white student must adjust to a situation where he is a member of a minority group. Engaged in a common pursuit, on an equal basis, he soon begins evaluating his Negro fellow students and members of the faculty as individuals, individuals as alike and as different as any he has previously known. Thus, he comes to know them as persons and racial characteristics tend to become secondary.

In this study we are concerned with only one aspect of this contact, namely its effect upon the racial attitudes of the white students. An attempt will thus be made to answer the following questions:

1. Have the attitudes of the white students changed?
2. What is the nature of the change, if any?
3. What were the problems of adjustment?
4. Does the experience have positive values as a means of improving racial understanding?

We should not expect that any appreciable number of those who come to Lincoln University will be strongly prejudiced because of the voluntary nature of the association. Any prejudice will probably be of the type which Myrdal characterizes as "Northern" based mainly upon ignorance and not greatly involved with fundamental conceptions of society and self.¹ Missouri, let us note, is a border state and as such has had, even before 1954, a gradually yielding attitude toward segregated schools.

This study is limited by the fact that it is dependent upon the subjects' opinions of their attitudes. Not only must we take opinions as an indication of present attitudes but also as an evaluation of attitudes held prior to matriculation at Lincoln. To measure the full effect of the experience upon the students' attitudes it would be necessary to measure attitudes before or at the time of matricu-

lation and measure again after a period of attendance. Since that was not possible in this study, we had to rely upon judgments made in retrospect.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

A questionnaire was mailed to a sample of eighty students drawn from a list of white students, compiled from the total student registry. Since there is no designation as to race, this list had to be compiled using the writer's knowledge of the white students and their places of residence. No person was included in the sample who had not been in attendance for at least two semesters. Regular, part-time and graduate students were included. There were fourteen items in the questionnaire, and these were mostly of the open-end type inviting further comment. The recipients were asked to make any extended comments on the back of the questionnaire and many of them wrote at length about their experiences. Sixty-two marked questionnaires were returned. In an effort to check the accuracy of their answers ten personal interviews were made with persons returning questionnaires. The same general pattern of responses was found in the interviews as in the questionnaire.

FINDINGS

The sample chanced to be approximately evenly divided between males and females and those returning questionnaires were also evenly divided as to sex; thirty-one of each. The inquiry did not seek specific ages but only whether the respondent was over or under twenty-five years of age. There were forty-five in the older age group and seventeen in the younger. Of those under twenty-five only four were females. The sample probably contained more of the older group since many of the white students attending Lincoln are persons taking advantage of the opportunity to obtain a delayed or interrupted college education. However, the number of younger white students is increasing with each session. The over twenty-five age group appeared more impressed with the experience, making extended comments on their questionnaires. In regard to academic status there were twenty-one regular and thirty-six part-time students who returned questionnaires. The sample contained approximately an equal number of regular and part-time students. The larger number of part-time students responding bears out the finding that the majority of the respondents were in the over twenty-five age group. Table I summarizes these data.

¹ Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York; Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1944), pp. 1142-1143.

TABLE I
Age, Sex, and Academic Status of White Students

Sex		Age		Academic Status		
		Under 25	Over 25	Regular	Part-Time	Graduate
Male	31	13	18	17	10	2
Female	31	4	27	4	26	3
Total	62	17	45	21	36	5

If we can rely upon the results of this inquiry, there has been considerable improvement in racial attitudes of the white students attending Lincoln University. Forty-nine persons or seventy-nine percent of the respondents said that their experience had given them an improved conception of Negroes. There was, it is true, none in the sample who admitted to strong racial prejudice at the time of registration. No student reported that the association increased his prejudice. Thirteen said that there was no change in their attitudes, but of these ten had initially favorable attitudes.

Several of this group had a background of satisfactory association with Negroes which perhaps accounts for the fact that they felt that there had been no real change in their initial attitudes. However, in spite of their assertion of no change of attitude they all expressed in their comments the belief that the experience was conducive to improvement of racial understanding and relationships. Five of the ten persons rating themselves as mildly prejudiced at the outset felt that their attitudes had improved and the remaining five indicated great improvement. Only two of the seventeen who rated themselves as initially indifferent remained so. One of these apparently resented the questionnaire and answered in a piqued manner. He is a regular student who takes part in campus activities and lists himself as having made friends, but he manifestly did not want to be questioned about his experiences. The data on attitudes are shown in Table II.

TABLE II
Attitudes of White Students Toward Negroes

Initial Attitude	Attitude After Attendance at Lincoln				Total
	Greatly Improved	Improved	No Change	Increased Prejudice	
Favorable	8	10	10	—	28
Benevolent	2	4	1	—	7
Indifferent	7	8	2	—	17
Mildly Prejudiced	5	5	—	—	10
Strongly Prejudiced	—	—	—	—	—
Total	22	27	13	—	62

In Table III are summarized some of the factors which are involved in the social characteristics of the white students insofar as they are relevant to this study.

TABLE III
Social Characteristics of White Students

<i>Factors Involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Previous contacts with Negroes	37	24*
Opportunities for interracial contacts in the community	28	32
Difficulty of adjustment	1	61
Felt prejudice directed toward them	7	55
Belong to interracial groups off campus	14	47*
More conscious of the problems of understanding	47	9*

* Not all persons checked every item.

These factors obviously call for some explanation. Thirty-seven persons had previous contacts with Negroes. These contacts ranged from the casual business and commercial relationships, through domestic servant relationships to the more intimate army friendships. Only twenty-eight persons said they had opportunities for interracial contacts in the communities where they live. It must be remembered that the Negro population of Missouri is largely concentrated in the urban centers of St. Louis and Kansas City. Many of these students come from the rural areas surrounding Jefferson City; thus a large number have no opportunity for contacts with Negroes other than on the campus.

Only one person reported difficulty of adjustment to the interracial situation. This student felt that the attitude of friends and relatives toward his attendance at Lincoln had complicated his adjustment. Of the seven persons who felt some prejudice directed toward them, two said that it came from the white community, while the others felt no active discrimination but rather the feeling of being an intruder. One respondent said that some of the Negro students seemed to doubt his sincerity. Another felt a "sort of barrier, possibly fellow students feel that I am prejudiced." Such expressions point up the psychological character of the problems involved in prejudice. Again, we must remember, however, that many of the white students are older persons who would experience the difficulty of bridging the age barrier in relationship with the younger Negro student.

Their comments testify that a large number of the white students came with some apprehension or uncertainty as to their reception, but in the great majority these feelings were rapidly dispelled. Insofar as the writer has been able to observe, the reception of white

students was natural and uncoached. There were no differential arrangements for whites. The writer, as one of the original participants in this process, regards the naturalness of the situation as perhaps its most remarkable feature.

Forty-seven students, approximately seventy-six percent of the sample, answered that they were more conscious of the problems of racial understanding than before. About one-fourth of the group belong to interracial groups off the campus: specifically, religious organizations, parent teacher associations, professional organizations, Boy Scout and Girl Scout committees. Here again we note the age characteristic of these students reflected in the type of organizations to which they belong.

As has been previously mentioned many persons made extended comments concerning their reactions to and impressions of this experience. These voluntary expressions perhaps give a more accurate indication of true attitudes than the answers to direct questions. It is not possible to include any large number of these comments but several representative ones follow:

"Everyone has been friendly, helpful and courteous."

"Teachers go out of their way to help students."

"We have something in common and have no time to be prejudiced."

"The lack of understanding and knowledge of the Negro is one of our problems. Here we can acquire this knowledge and understanding."

"I believe we are less inclined to notice the difference in race as such and to respect the value of each individual without regard to color."

"I have had some very harsh remarks made to me by some of my friends and relatives, but I expected that and have not let it bother me."

CONCLUSIONS

We have found that there was improvement in the attitudes of the white students toward Negroes. Even those who responded as initially favorable, for the most part registered improvement. Furthermore, there were no real problems of adjustment to the interracial situation.

It would be difficult to determine precisely what the white students expected to find at Lincoln University. This study gives only an intimation. It was, after all, a situation with many unknowns but their comments indicate that they were agreeably surprised at

its naturalness, and that they readily fell into line with the real business of the college.

The equal status, common purpose, nature of the contacts, plus the reversal of the majority-minority roles are perhaps the most important factors in this experience. The first two form the basis for understanding and the latter forces the white student to face squarely any prejudice he might have. The fact that the majority of these white students are mature individuals is evidence that adults can and will modify their attitudes under the proper circumstances.

It is impossible to estimate the influence that these persons will have upon the communities from which they come. We should expect however, that every person who has experienced improvement in his attitude toward Negroes will in some measure be an ambassador of better racial understanding. The fact that many of these students are teachers or prospective teachers makes this even more significant.

The general character of the racial attitudes in the community will be a factor of considerable weight. In Jefferson City itself there is still a great deal of social segregation. The public schools, some civic organizations and a few churches are integrated, but generally the community is still a segregated one. There will thus be strong community pressures to conform rather than to attempt reforms. For most of these students campus activities are largely separate from the rest of their lives. For them it is a world of new experiences, but one which they do not know how to bring into full relationship with the realities of the communities in which they live.

This survey has attempted to measure changes in the attitudes of white students toward Negroes as a result of attendance at Lincoln University. It is thus only half the story. To understand the situation fully a study of the effect of the same interaction upon the attitudes of the Negro students would be a necessary supplement. Certainly, this is a highly dynamic situation and one which has positive import for the understanding and improving of racial relationships.

Mrs. Elaine M. Aber is a teacher in the Jefferson City Public Schools.

FOUNDATION POLICIES IN REGARD TO NEGRO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Frederick D. Patterson

Private philanthropic foundations have played a major role in the education of Negro youth at all levels. Most foundations with an expressed interest in Negro education, came into existence during the present century. For nearly a half century, five foundations played a leading role in the field of Negro education. They assisted education at all levels though their emphasis has been varied. Some of them, such as Jeanes Fund, made a major contribution to the development of rural elementary schools. In recent years and with augmented resources, the foundation now holding Jeanes Fund monies has worked with selected colleges and universities to improve administration in secondary and consolidated schools. This program has been in operation for several years under the Southern Education Foundation, the latter resulting from a merger of the Jeanes and Slater Funds. The merged institution was established in New York in 1937. Actually, four previously separate entities made up this foundation. They are the George Peabody Fund (1867), the John F. Slater Fund (1882), the Anna T. Jeanes Fund (1907), and the Virginia Randolph Fund (1938). The Southern Education Foundation also operates with grants received from other foundations for specific projects or special purposes.

The Rosenwald Fund was incorporated October 30, 1917, under the laws of the State of Illinois. Although its broad chartered purpose was "the well-being of mankind," the bulk of its resources were expended to improve educational opportunity for Negroes. During the first ten years of its existence, it spent \$4,049,974. All but a half million of this amount went for its program of building "Rosenwald Schools" for Negro children in the South. When this program ended in 1932, 5,357 schools and educational buildings had been constructed at a total cost of \$28,408,520. Of this amount, the Rosenwald Fund and Negroes had each contributed more than \$4,000,000, the balance coming largely from tax funds.

From this point on, the Fund gave increasingly for the promotion of higher education. The Fund accomplished this in two important ways. First, it sought to identify and support education in strategic metropolitan centers in the South, such as Atlanta, Nashville, New Orleans, Washington, D. C.; and, second, it made awards for advanced or special study to Negroes of unusual talent.

Even a brief account of the policy of the Rosenwald Fund should not overlook an outstanding characteristic of its President, Edwin

R. Embree, who constantly sought to have the Fund exercise the greatest flexibility in its granting program.

Two examples with which the writer is familiar illustrate the point. The first was the prompt and full response to the appeal that the Rosenwald Fund shared with the General Education Board and the member colleges themselves in underwriting the cost of the first campaign undertaken by the United Negro College Fund. In 1939, the Rosenwald Fund loaned Tuskegee Institute more than \$200,000 to purchase land and erect the facilities required to establish a primary air flight school. Tuskegee Institute thus was enabled to become one of the number of private contract schools operated by the U. S. Air Force in the Southeastern Area. A loan, rather than a grant, was made because the financial terms of the contract permitted the full amortization of all costs involved.

The above action by the Rosenwald Fund was an expression of its effort to equalize opportunity among the nation's richly diverse people. The Fund effectively exemplified the ways in which organized philanthropy operating with full flexibility and with imagination and courage, could embark upon pioneering projects of great significance to mankind. Thus, the Rosenwald Fund addressed itself to education, health, race relations, and fellowships. It found that most programs amenable to foundation assistance could be considered under these broad categories.

There were many who, while accepting the general wisdom of Julius Rosenwald's provision that both the income and principal of his gift establishing the Fund should be expended within 25 years of the time of his death, greatly regretted the discontinuance of so potent and useful an influence at a period of critical transition.

The General Education Board was incorporated in 1903 and was started on its long and significant philanthropies in education by a pledge of \$1,000,000 by Mr. Rockefeller. This amount was augmented by periodic gifts of substantially larger amounts. When the GEB discontinued its active program of philanthropy in 1957, it had expended a total sum of \$60,000,000 to improve educational opportunity for Negroes. The Board, with a primary interest in Negro education, early reached the conclusion, as did other funds and foundations of similar interest, that an interracial approach was both necessary and desirable. In the early years, expression of this policy resulted in the underwriting of appointments to enable Negroes to receive services parallel to those provided for whites. Likewise, the disparity in public education was lessened by the financing of liaison or supervisory personnel in state departments of education

whose primary responsibility was to guide the development of education for Negro youth and to secure as large outlays in its behalf as possible. Thus, there came into being the first Negro agricultural agents and the state agents of Negro education who were white. These latter had the specific job of overcoming the neglect of Negro public school education which was widespread. Under the leadership of the Negro agricultural agent, the rural Negro population received a parallel, if not equal, opportunity to improve farm and family life.

The GEB, an important unit of the Rockefeller philanthropies, was primarily a granting organization and accomplished its work by giving support to other agencies. It was incorporated by an act of Congress January 12, 1903. For many years, its primary concern was the improvement of higher education for Negro youth. It accomplished this by working almost exclusively through institutions of higher learning. Its scholarship and fellowship awards were made to institutions rather than individuals. The individual recipients were chosen by the institution and then interviewed by an officer of the General Education Board.

Some foundations restrict their grants to institutions to any one of several categories, such as fellowships, equipment endowment, or capital improvements. The General Education Board gave to all categories once it decided an institution was worthy of assistance.

In giving to a financial campaign, a matching feature was usually involved. In several instances, the Board permitted the income from a grant made as a conditional commitment to be used during the qualifying period.

Fully equal to its generosity in the granting of monies was the careful and sympathetic guidance and encouragement given over the years of its activity by members of its staff.

There were few campuses of Negro colleges during the 1903-1950 period that had not been visited many times by L. M. Favrot, Jackson Davis, Albert R. Mann, and Fred McQuiston. And before their time, there was Wallace M. Buttrick and Abraham Flexner and others. These men, most of them Southerners, were able to work well with state departments of education and often secured from them commitments of expenditure and the extension of interest of a most valued sort to the progress and development of education for Negro youth. The GEB encouraged and supported projects originated by others rather than to have others undertake projects which the Board originated or conceived to be of value. This was a wise administrative device because projects, regardless of their potential worth, are not likely to succeed unless they grow out of

the experience and concern of those who attempt to carry them out. Almost every inexperienced and eager administrator eventually comes to know that passing along fully fashioned concepts for others to execute, is unwise procedure. Backing proven competence was, in the writer's opinion, responsible for much of the success attained by General Education Board grants.

Typical of this approach was the support which the Board gave to the primary underwriting of the United Negro College Fund and of its sustained interest and later benefactions in support of this effort. Impressed that the basic idea behind a proposal was sound, the Board cooperated closely and effectively in guiding the organization and procedure required for the idea's full implementation. Dr. Lindsley F. Kimball has been the General Education Board's representative and the United Negro College Fund's ever helpful counselor and worker in many key relations of leadership over fifteen years of Fund activity.

The Phelps-Stokes Fund was established in 1911. It was made possible by Miss Caroline Phelps Stokes who provided in her will that, after paying "bequests and devises" by her executors, all of her residuary estate be held in trust forever by trustees in a fund to be known as the Phelps-Stokes Fund. In addition to the nine trustees mentioned in Miss Stokes' will by name, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York City and the Chancellor of the University of the City of New York were named *ex officio*.

The will stipulated that the interest and net income of the Fund be used for the erection or improvement of tenement house dwellings in New York City and for educational purposes. Negroes, both in Africa and the United States, North American Indians and needy and deserving white students were to receive the monies allocated for educational purposes.

Three basic operating principles which were developed and received early Board approval are:

1. That in providing for the establishment of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the testatrix showed a special, although by no means exclusive, interest in Negro education.
2. That it is wise for this Board to dispense its philanthropy as far as possible through existing institutions of proven experience and assured stability.
3. That the cooperation of the best white citizens of the South is of prime importance in solving the problem of Negro education.

Early appropriations of the Fund related themselves directly to the above principles of operation. The first grant in the amount of \$2,500 was made to the treasurer of the Jeanes Fund in 1911 "to provide salaries for county supervisors of Negro schools in the South." The second and third grants provided fellowships at the Universities of Georgia and Virginia to encourage "southern youth of broad sympathies" to conduct studies in the area of Negro life. A year later the decision was taken to employ an "agent" to make a field study of Negro education. It was out of this background of interest and action that the Phelps-Stokes Fund, in collaboration with the Bureau of Education of the U. S. Department of Interior, undertook a thoroughgoing evaluation of Negro education, both public and private. This study, published in 1917, was entitled, "A Study of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States." Because of the completely frank analysis which this study gave educational efforts, or the lack of them, it was considered a significant directive to public and private agencies alike. Schools which carried the names of colleges and universities were declared, on the basis of curricula offerings and records of performance, actually to be glorified high schools. Out of the anger and embarrassment which the study frequently called forth, sound efforts for improvement emerged.

As an organization of limited capital resources, the Phelps-Stokes Fund has promoted its program by augmenting its expendable income with monies secured from foundations, individuals, and government agencies to undertake specific programs within the scope of its interest. It uses the term "guest funds" for monies received in this way. It has also chosen with care projects that could be initiated or significantly helped with modest grants from its own income. An important part of the Fund's service has stemmed from the availability of its professional staff for consultation and membership on boards of trustees of colleges, universities, and committees or planning commissions within its program of interest.

The Carnegie Corporation of New York has in years past played a helpful role in the development of higher education for Negro youth. Many private colleges for Negro youth were given Carnegie libraries. Grants for special purposes were made on the basis of individual application and merit. The Carnegie Corporation shared with the General Education Board the sum required to initiate and partially underwrite the \$25,000,000 capital funds campaign of the United Negro College Fund.

The Carnegie Corporation originated and underwrote the monu-

mental study of the Negro in the United States which was published under the title, "The American Dilemma." This is often referred to as the "Myrdal Study" after its director, Gunnar Myrdal of Sweden. This study is credited with having a major influence on activity in the civil rights field, including the Supreme Court's decision on public education in 1954. Equally, perhaps, it can be said to have influenced higher educational provisions as well.

Colleges for Negro youth have also been helped by the program conducted by Harvard University for new college presidents and their wives. This program is underwritten by the Carnegie Corporation.

The Ford Foundation, through the Fund for the Advancement of Education, contributed \$1,000,000 to the capital funds campaign of the United Negro College Fund. Colleges for Negro youth were included in the sixty-college study detailing the relative standing of the group in terms of income and expenditures. This study was sponsored by the National Federation of College and University Business Officers Associations. Later, private colleges for Negro youth shared in the multi-million-dollar grant of the Ford Foundation to private colleges and universities. Grants from the Fund for the Advancement of Education enabled the United Negro College Fund to institute a program of special services, unrelated to money raising per se, in behalf of its membership. A special grant also enabled the College Fund to undertake a study of 25 of its colleges in close association with the sixty-college study previously referred to.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, now the National Foundation, though restricted to the field of health, has been generous in its recognition of the special needs of institutions with programs in the health field and has been equally generous to individuals in its provision of scholarships for specialized study and advanced training.

Foundation grants of the present decade have for the most part overlooked the continuing problems being faced by colleges concerned primarily with the education of Negro youth. Such institutions have been included in grants made to broad categories of institutions, as in the case of the sixty-college study, and this perhaps presages the pattern of the future. While there can certainly be no quarrel with this approach in terms of the goal of integration, the fact that colleges for Negro youth fare less well, in terms of individual gifts, presents them with unusual difficulty in the area of financial support.

There still seems to be definite need for foundations with specific interest in the special needs of Negro youth for higher education

and with sufficient flexibility to assist at the time and in ways where the assistance will be of strategic help, both in preparation for integration and in meeting the pressing need of Negro youth who must be educated now.

In attempting to write specifically about what a limited number of foundations have done in behalf of Negro institutions of higher education, it can be seen that, for limited periods at least, any phase of institutional operation amenable to improvement by better financing has been the object of interest of some one or more foundations.

Foundation policies are often reviewed and frequently change. These changes are made when it is felt unhappy results have accrued or better use can be made of monies available by a different granting policy. Policy changes may also reflect the feeling that the need envisaged under a given policy has been met or is now accepted as a public responsibility. Many foundations avoid giving to "brick and mortar" needs of institutions. The reason for this is not too clear since adequate housing of educational or research programs is just as important as other needs. Perhaps it regards the giving of buildings as a preferred choice in individual giving.

Foundations are primarily interested in seeing their monies stimulate new and significant projects. They do not, as a rule, give to an institution simply because it is without an important or essential service or facility if such has already proven its worth.

Many foundations do not give to endowments. This seems particularly true in recent years. Here, the feeling often expressed is that low yield requires such large sums to be worthwhile and the foundations would rather underwrite current operations for limited periods. It is difficult if not impossible, however, to state any policy which is universally followed. The tax structure favors foundation development by both individuals and corporations. As a result, the number of foundations has doubled in the last decade. In these, the giving policies may be fixed or widely flexible. Institutions interested in monies for any purpose should research the giving policies of the foundations they plan to approach and be guided accordingly.

Frederick D. Patterson is President of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DEEP SOUTH

Stanley H. Smith

Within the past ten years, the subject of academic freedom has been discussed, debated and written about with increasing frequency.¹ In recent years, particularly since the Supreme Court Decision of May 1954 concerning desegregation, numerous allegations of threats to academic freedom have been raised in the South. Despite this, however, attention has been primarily centered on academic freedom in relation to loyalty oaths and fifth-amendment professors. Little attention has been given to the increasing invasion of academic freedom in connection with the covert and/or overt attempts made to control the thoughts and actions of professors in the Deep South who attempt to analyze the southern structure in the light of changing social conditions.

The importance of academic freedom as an indispensable aspect of the learning process has been recognized by the American Association of University Professors in its 1940 statement of principles. This statement affirms in part that:

"Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights."²

Also of significance, is the further clarification of the teacher's role and responsibility. The statement of principles accordingly states that:

"The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen he should be free from

¹ Cf. Sidney Hook, *Heresy Yes—Conspiracy No* (New York: John Day 1953); T. E. Coulton, *A City College in Action* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1955); R. M. Hutchins, *The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953); Russell Kirk, *Academic Freedom* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955).

² Reprinted in the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Vol. 44 (March 1958), p. 291.

institutional censorship or discipline but his special position in the community imposes special obligations."³

Academic freedom, however, cannot be meaningfully discussed outside of the context of the social structure. The nature of the organization of the social structure will have some influence on the presence or absence of threats to academic freedom. This becomes sociologically meaningful when it is considered that the educational institution is but one of the social institutions which are closely interrelated in a unique configuration. Consequently, any change in one will affect not only change in the other social institutions but also the total configuration.

The validity of the above statement can be evaluated in terms of an analysis of the conditions under which academic freedom received one of its largest threats—the recent loyalty oath controversy. The American social structure was at that time, in the process of making the necessary adjustments from a wartime economy and was consequently experiencing certain imbalances resulting in increasing unemployment, threats to economic security, rising social tensions and increased stresses with concomitant feelings of suspicion and mistrust. This was the cultural milieu which gave rise nationally to attempts on the part of both external and internal influences to regulate academic activities of educational institutions throughout the country.

The southern social structure is characterized to a large extent by a vocal authoritarian minority. This minority makes major decisions, controls the media of communication and gives the nod to the type of issues which may be discussed or the type of action which may be participated in. It constitutes the power elite. This condition is particularly evident in states in which the plantation economy is still found; states which are still primarily rural and agricultural and states in which the one party system—Democratic—still exists and in which there is a concentration of "poor whites" and Negroes. In these states, power and authority are centralized and vested in few hands and attempts are made by the power structure to maintain the *status quo*. This is an atmosphere conducive to coercive conformity and not academic freedom. In such states, there is generally direct interference on the part of state officials in the operation of the schools. In the higher institutions there are threats of appropriation cuts for lack of conformity to the expected pattern of behavior.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 291.

These are conditions which have not made the South traditionally an atmosphere conducive to academic freedom. These factors account to a certain extent for the fact that "great" universities and other institutions of higher learning are not generally found in the South. It is difficult and well nigh impossible to build up a "community" of scholars in such a social milieu. This will certainly affect the kind of society because a society in which there are threats to academic freedom cannot be technically classified as a free society. Referring more specifically to the role of the educational institution as an important aspect of the social structure, Hutchins states:

"The educational system does not aim at indoctrination in accepted values but at the improvement of society through the production of the intelligent man and the good citizen. Education necessarily involves the critical examination of conflicting points of view. It cannot flourish in the absence of free inquiry and discussion."⁴

It is in the Deep South, therefore, that covert and/or overt attempts will seemingly be made on the part of state officials, state legislatures and state boards of education to coerce compliance with established practices and procedures and discourage academic freedom. Journet Kahn addresses himself succinctly to this point when he states that—

"There is ample evidence that in no few colleges and universities there exists a widespread atmosphere of over-cautiousness and fear with respect to the expression of what might be considered unpopular views. Such an atmosphere may in the end prove more damaging to the unconstrained collective search for scientific objectivity and its communication than the handful of conspiratorial professors who have not yet managed to accomplish the ruin of this intellectual vitality of American youth."⁵

Commenting further on techniques and threats to academic freedom, Kahn implies that it is not the primary responsibility of institutions of higher learning to maintain a particular political and economic structure but to assist in the discovery and dissemination of truths "regardless of its acceptability to special interests."⁶

⁴ R. M. Hutchins, "The Meaning and Significance of Academic Freedom" *The Annals*, Vol. 300 (July 1955), p. 72.

⁵ Journet Kahn, "The Threat to Academic Freedom," reprinted from the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*, (1957), p. 9.

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 9.

An analysis of the techniques adopted in the states of the Deep South against academic freedom, indicates that it is seemingly the consensus that one of the primary roles of an educational institution is maintenance of a particular socio-politico-economic structure—the southern way of life.

The above analysis does seem to suggest that the nature of the social structure of the Deep South has traditionally not been conducive to the fullest operation of the principles of academic freedom. The desegregation issue has only increased the frequency and intensity of these threats to academic freedom.

Within this context therefore, it is fitting to examine the presence or absence of and the nature of these threats to academic freedom in institutions of higher learning in the states of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina. Particular attention will be paid to this phenomenon since the Supreme Court decision of May, 1954.

ALABAMA

The Autherine Lucy incident was one of the first important incidents in the State of Alabama since May, 1954 which exerted any great influence on academic freedom in that state. Three days of violent demonstration followed the admittance of Miss Lucy to the University of Alabama. When the Board of Trustees finally excluded Miss Lucy, the president of the institution defended the board's action at a faculty meeting. In this meeting, however two members of the faculty raised objections to the Board's decision, claiming that it had surrendered to mob rule.

In addition to the above, the Lucy incident resulted in a number of faculty members submitting their resignations. According to the March 1957 issue of *Ebony*—"During the past year, 21 or more teachers have resigned from the faculty some of them as a direct result of the Autherine Lucy 'case.' One of the first to announce his intention of leaving was Professor Harry Shaffer, Associate Professor of Economics. Shaffer stated as his reason that the democratic principles in which he believed were 'so badly violated at the University of Alabama that I did not feel I could remain, in spite of my sincere love and devotion to the state, this community, and to my colleagues.'"⁷

According to the *Ebony* account, most of the teachers who resigned as a result of the Lucy affair were from northern or border states. At least one southerner, William Lampard, Mississippi-born, was identified. According to Lampard, the treatment received by

⁷ Quoted in *Ebony*, (March 1957), p. 51.

Miss Lucy made him "ashamed, deeply ashamed to be a southern white man, even a liberated southern white man." In leaving the University of Alabama and going to the University of Vermont, Lampard took a \$1,200 salary cut. He was not very proud of his action and states accordingly—"I admire those people who can stay there and fight for what is right and just."⁸

The University of *Alabama News Bureau* in a reply to the *Ebony* article stated that "the University has a normal turn-over each Spring of 30 to 50 faculty members with an overall figure now at 550. Last Spring was no exception and six of the 35 faculty members leaving gave the Lucy affair as one of the major reasons for their leaving."⁹ It is significant to note that there was a willingness to admit that at least six persons left as a result of the Lucy affair. This suggests very strongly that there was recognition of a definite change in the atmosphere and that academic freedom was in jeopardy.

Shortly following the Lucy incident the president of the university, Dr. O. C. Carmichael, resigned. It is interesting to note that his successor as president of the University of Alabama emphasized his belief in southern customs while commenting on his views to reporters. He allegedly stated:

"I am a native of Mississippi and love the fine traditions of the South. I will give the university the finest leadership at my command . . . Transylvania is where Jefferson Davis went to school. It also produced a number of Confederate Army generals including Albert Sidney Johnson and John Hunt Morgan. We are proud of our traditions at Transylvania."¹⁰

Negro institutions are by no means exempt from external pressures. Whenever it becomes evident that forces in Alabama are bringing about the type of social change which might disrupt the traditional way of life, Tuskegee Institute invariably comes into the picture. As an evident deterrent to desegregation moves emanating from the 1954 Supreme Court Decision, the Alabama Legislative Council recommended on March 8, 1957 that the legislature cut off the state appropriation to Tuskegee Institute if any Negro is allowed to attend a white state supported college.

It is not at all surprising then, that increasingly within recent

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁹ Quoted in *Southern School News* (March 1957) pp. 12-13.

¹⁰ Quoted in *Southern School News*, (October 1957) p. 4.

years, and particularly at the time approaching state appropriations, attempts are made to coerce and to intimidate the faculty indirectly by threatening to cut off the state appropriation.

Despite these threats and subtle intimidations, however, no faculty member of Tuskegee Institute has been dismissed or forced to resign for position taken or utterances made. In this case, external forces have not as yet succeeded in threatening academic freedom. It points up the important role which the administration and the board of trustees can play in resisting efforts to curtail academic freedom.

Alabama Polytechnic Institute also experienced some pressure on freedom of operation and expression. There, an assistant professor of economics and business, Bud R. Hutchinson, was dismissed because of a letter he wrote to the editor of *The Plainsman*, a student newspaper. This letter was a critical reply to an editorial on the problems of integration in New York. Hutchinson's letter implied that due recognition should be given to the fact that the authorities in New York are willing to come to grips with the difficult problem of integration. He stated that, "Rather than sneer at the attempts of the New York City Board of Education to cope with this social problem, all who would really love humanity should strongly commend them for their courage and intelligence."¹¹

The President of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, in explaining the reason for the dismissal, stated that Bud R. Hutchinson had expressed opinions "contrary to the views of Alabama Polytechnic Institute." On August 23, 1956, as a result of the controversy stirred up by Hutchinson's letter and his subsequent dismissal, the trustees at Alabama Polytechnic Institute announced a new policy concerning academic freedom. The new policy was the resultant of the great concern shown by the members of the faculty concerning threats to academic freedom. In essence, it justified the board's action in failing to renew the contract of the faculty member because of his views on integration.

The case was appealed to the American Association of University Professors on the grounds that the administration had violated academic freedom. A committee representing the Association of University Professors visited the campus in order to investigate the charge. After collecting and weighing the evidence the Committee came to the following broad conclusions:

1. Despite the fact that Hutchinson did not have tenure, he was entitled to academic freedom as a citizen and as a teacher.

¹¹ Quoted from the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Vol. 44 (March, 1958) pp. 159-160.

2. "Refusal to reappoint a teacher because of an unpopular expression of views on segregation does involve a question of academic freedom. . . ." ¹²

3. "Professor Hutchinson's action in writing a letter to the editor was a valid exercise of his freedom to express his views as a citizen and did not involve a breach of the canons of appropriate restraint, respect for the opinion of others, and duty to dissociate one's view from that of the institution." ¹³

With reference to the appropriateness of discussing issues dealing with school segregation, the committee stated:

It must be recognized that academic freedom cannot be measured or limited by vague threats to the welfare of an institution or a community which may or may not result from what a professor says or does. If a professor must hold his tongue lest he cause an alumnus to withhold a gift, a legislator to vote against an appropriation, a student not to register, or a citizen's feelings to be ruffled, he will be free to talk only to himself. ¹⁴

GEORGIA

Threats to academic freedom in higher education were not as overtly pronounced in the state of Georgia as has been evident in Alabama. This situation may be partially due to the fact that incidents like the Lucy "case" have not arisen to disturb the status quo.

That the atmosphere is unfavorable to academic freedom is evident in the fact that the Georgia State Board of Education banned the use of three school textbooks on the secondary level. The reason given was not that these books were of no educational value, but that they were not in agreement with, and therefore not in the best interest of the "southern way of life."

There were two incidents which threw further light on potential threats to academic freedom in higher education in Georgia. The first incident concerned itself with Georgia Institute of Technology and its football team. In this case, objections were raised over the fact that this school was scheduled to play the University of Pittsburgh in the Sugar Bowl on January 2, 1956 and that this University has a Negro halfback on the team. As a result, the Governor of Georgia wired the chairman of the Board of Regents on December 2, 1955, requesting that the board meet immediately to bar any state school

¹² *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Op. Cit. page 167.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

from either competing with teams using Negroes or playing before a nonsegregated audience. Supporting the governor's move were the utterances of members of the state legislature with respect to the cutting off of appropriations.

The second incident concerned itself with Guy H. Wells, former President of Georgia State College for Women. Mainly because of his pro-integration views, the Georgia State Board of Regents took away from him the title of President Emeritus of the College. This action was again consistent with the determination of state officials to discourage the expression of views in favor of desegregation on the part of educators.

MISSISSIPPI

As in the case of Alabama, there were certain overt threats to academic freedom in higher education in the State of Mississippi. One of the significant techniques resorted to in this endeavor is the screening of speakers appearing on the campuses of state educational institutions. A situation such as this arose when Reverend Alvin Kershaw was invited to participate in Religious Emphasis Week at the University of Mississippi in 1956. His invitation was cancelled when it was known that he was a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This incident led to the immediate resignation of Dr. Morton King, Chairman of the Department of Sociology at the University of Mississippi since 1946. King stated that one of the main determinants of his resignation was the professional principle involved which affected academic freedom. He implied further that this was just one in a series of incidents affecting the same principle. There were repercussions at Mississippi State College where there were faculty resignations and where six of the scheduled speakers of its Religious Emphasis Week withdrew.

A series of articles written by Jay Milner in the *Delta Democrat Times* substantiated further the evidence relating to the relative absence of academic freedom at the University of Mississippi. These series of articles quoted from professors who charged the administration with restrictions on academic freedom. In replying to these charges, the chancellor of the university stated that although the forty-one resignations from a full time staff of 200 may be a little more than normal, but not alarmingly so."¹⁵

The pressures exerted on academic freedom on higher education by private organizations and groups are not to be ignored. As a

¹⁵ This article was referred to at length in *Southern School News* (April, 1958), p. 5.

result of a pro-integration address delivered at Millsaps College of Jackson, the White Citizens Council of the city demanded an explanation from the college officials as to their position. The college board yielding to this demand, issued a statement to the effect that the policy of the college was always in favor of segregation.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The state of South Carolina experienced certain threats to academic freedom in both white and Negro institutions of higher education. As in the case of Alabama, attempts were made to curb the freedom of expression and actions of private Negro institutions. In this case, it was the withholding of the acceptance of graduates of this institution for teacher certification unless the institution conformed to certain requirements concerning the discontinuance of the services of certain members of the faculty whose views were not acceptable to state officials. In the case of the State College for Negroes, more direct pressures were effectively exerted.

Repercussions were felt in the state of South Carolina when the General Assembly in 1956 adopted certain pro-segregation measures. Herein were to be observed indications of the pressures which were to be exerted on educational institutions of higher learning, particularly, Negro institutions. The following measures were paramount: 1.) All appropriations for institutions of higher learning were made on the basis of racial segregation. 2.) If any of the institutions were forced to close as a result of a court order for integration, the South Carolina State College for Negroes will likewise be closed. 3) It is unlawful for any member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to be employed by the State, county, or municipal governments. 4.) A joint resolution was passed authorizing the establishment of a nine-member committee to investigate activities of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People among the faculty and students of South Carolina State College (for Negroes).

These moves on the part of the legislature, particularly the last were to have very significant repercussions. Beginning April 9, 1956, the students of South Carolina State College refused to attend classes in protest to the proposed investigation of the alleged practices of the NAACP. The strike ended on April 13, after President Turner informed students that they ran the risk of expulsion if they persisted in remaining away from classes. On April 25, the Board of Trustees of the college (all white) met to investigate the strike. This action resulted in the expulsion of the president of the student body, Fred

Moore. In June, the secretary of the board of trustees announced that fifteen additional students were notified not to return for the next school year. The secretary also announced that the contracts of three faculty members were not renewed and that several other teachers had not sought renewal of their contracts.¹⁶ It is seemingly apparent that these teachers believed that the atmosphere was not conducive to academic freedom.

The incident at Allen University, a private Negro institution in South Carolina, is further evidence of direct or indirect pressure on an institution by state officials to control its academic policies and procedures. On September 9, the State Board of Education, at a special meeting, decided to withhold acceptance of the graduates of Allen University for teacher certification. According to a partial text of the resolution:

The approval of Allen University for teacher training is withheld until such time as the Board of Education may determine that it is in the public interest to grant approval and the State Department of Education is directed to withhold certification of its graduates until approval is granted.¹⁷

Two factors were held accountable for this action. The first was the Board's apparent objection to the presence of white professors on the staff whose names were ostensibly on the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The second was the enrollment of a white student from Hungary—the first white student at a Negro institution of higher learning in South Carolina.

The above action on the part of the State Board of Education was backed by claims from the governor of the state who further alleged that individuals with communist leanings may be at work at Allen University. The governor later charged Benedict College, another private Negro institution in the state, with having communists there. He stated that:

It is believed that the presence of communists at these two Negro institutions is in furtherance of a long-range program to promote racial hatred among young and impressionable Negro students, looking toward an ultimate communist goal of creating civil and racial disorder.¹⁸

¹⁶ *Southern School News*, (July, 1956), p. 11.

¹⁷ Quoted from *Southern School News* (October 1957), p. 13.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

The following further developments emanated from the charges of the governor and the actions of the State Board of Education:

- 1.) Legislation to create a joint committee to investigate communism in the state was introduced in both houses of the General Assembly.
- 2.) The Negro Inter-denominational Ministerial Alliance expressed grave doubts that the investigation will be fairly conducted and stated further that it was a threat to the academic freedom of Negro teachers.
- 3.) The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Benedict College promised to rid itself of any communist or communist sympathizers.
- 4.) The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Benedict College gave notice of the fact that it had inserted an anti-communist oath for faculty members.
- 5.) Three of the professors at Allen University and three at Benedict College who were accused of communist leanings were asked to resign.¹⁰

Following these actions, at a meeting of the State Board of Education, on June 20, Allen University was restored to its former position with respect to teacher training and certification. Also of note is the fact that the Hungarian student did not register in September 1958 at Allen University. It was reported that he was informed that the university administration did not expect his return.

CONCLUSION

Certain conclusions are in order. Of paramount importance to the threat posed to academic freedom in the Deep South is the very close relationship existing between the operation of state-owned institutions of higher education and governmental officials.

It is noteworthy that these schools are dependent on state appropriations and that the Board of Trustees are usually directly or indirectly responsible to these state officials.

Also of relevance is the paucity of large private institutions in the Deep South. This makes it difficult for these institutions to withstand intense pressures for academic conformity which may be exerted by external forces.

It is evident that integration is one of the subjects which is not open for discussion at state colleges in the South. It is also evident that there is a correlation between increasing intensity of threats to academic freedom and attempts made at desegregation in any form. One will expect therefore, that as the desegregation movement accelerates in the future that threats to academic freedom will also increase in intensity.

The present nature of the social climate and the increasing pres-

¹⁰ *Southern School News* (June 1958), p. 15.

sure for conformity with its consequent impact on academic freedom have affected and will continue to affect the academic standards of the colleges and universities of the Deep South. Because of conditions of social unrest and the increasing threats to academic freedom, a significant number of Southern professors are leaving and have left the South and have accepted positions in Northern universities. Professors from the North are reluctant to accept positions in universities of the Deep South. Consequently these universities experience great difficulty in filling positions with competent teachers.²⁰

The American Association of University Professors called specific attention to this matter at its 43rd annual meeting in New York on April 27, 1957 when it stated in its resolution that it viewed "with alarm the loss, and threatened further loss, of teachers and students by institutions of higher learning subject to repressive laws and social forces in sections of the country where the principles enunciated by the United States Supreme Court with respect to racial segregation are being resisted."²¹

As further proof of its knowledge of and concern for increasing threats to academic freedom in the South, the American Association of University Professors accepted recently a grant from the Jerome Levy Foundation to aid professors who are discharged or suspended in violation of principles of academic freedom. In announcing their acceptance of this grant, the general secretary of the Association stated that "it was recognized that the objective and dispassionate nature of teaching and research will sometimes be misunderstood by an excited public opinion, and that in its extreme form when this excitement is about evolution, loyalty oaths, or racial segregation, public opinion can become a tyranny."²²

This, therefore, is a recognition of the trend that threats to academic freedom in the Deep South will increase as rapid changes in its social structure continue to take place.

²⁰ Personal interviews with some white professors, including heads of departments of institutions of higher learning in the Deep South, substantiated the above conclusions with respect to the effect of social climate on difficulties in teacher procurement.

²¹ Quoted in the *NAIRO Reporter* (May, 1957) p. 3.

²² Quoted in the *Pittsburgh Courier*, (September 27, 1958).

Stanley H. Smith is Acting-Chairman, Division of the Social Sciences at Tuskegee Institute.

THE PROSPECT OF NEGRO HIGHER EDUCATION

Charles H. Thompson

During the past twenty years since the *Gaines* decision (see Guzman and Trent)¹ a number of events have occurred—not all of them a direct result of the decision per se—which have had and will continue to have varied effects upon Negro higher education. There has been an almost phenomenal growth in graduate and professional work offered by Negro higher institutions, particularly those controlled and supported by the states. As a result of a series of court decisions, there has been some desegregation of enrollments in erst-while white higher institutions in thirteen states and the District of Columbia. (See Johnson.) After twenty-five years of differential rating of Negro and white higher institutions in its area, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (see Trent) decided in 1956 to rate Negro institutions on exactly the same standards as whites, and to admit those qualifying to full membership. The United Negro College Fund² (see Trent)—undoubtedly one of the most unique developments in higher education in general during the past twenty years—was established in 1943 to obtain greater financial aid for Negro private accredited colleges.

THE GAINES DECISION

The most direct effect of the *Gaines* decision was the phenomenal increase in graduate and professional work offered by Negro higher institutions. And particularly was this true of tax-supported institutions which were ordered to offer such work by state officials, in order to meet the requirements of the decision within the segregated framework. In the fall of 1938, just before the *Gaines* decision was handed down, only seven Negro institutions (five private and two public) offered graduate work, with an enrollment of 478 students, only 30 of whom were enrolled in publicly-supported institutions.³ Ten years later (1947-48), sixteen Negro institutions were offering graduate work. Ten of these sixteen schools were publicly-supported institutions with 70 per cent of the total enrollment of 1140 students

¹ References to authors of other papers in this issue will be noted in parentheses rather than by formal citation.

² Hereafter designated as UNCF.

³ See: Martin D. Jenkins "Higher Education: Enrollment in Negro Colleges and Universities, 1938-39." *Journal of Negro Education* 8:247-253, April 1939.

in the regular term, 54 per cent of the total enrollment of the 5067 for the summer session; and 48 per cent of the masters' degrees awarded.⁴ By 1953—the last year that comparable statistics are available—the ten publicly-supported colleges out of the 17 institutions giving graduate work enrolled 65 per cent of the 2321 students taking graduate work during the regular term, 76 per cent of the 6929 graduate students enrolled in summer school; and awarded 53 per cent of the 1478 masters' degrees earned.⁵

The unfortunate aspect of this mushroom growth of graduate work, especially in the state institutions, was that the overwhelming majority of them were unprepared to give such work. In fact, as late as 1957, three-fifths of the state institutions offering graduate work to over half of the graduate students in Negro schools were not fully approved by the Southern Association, their regional accrediting agency. And to make matters worse, under the pressure of the *Sweatt*, *Sipuel* and *McLaurin* decisions (see Guzman) which were the logical and inevitable sequel of the *Gaines* decision, some of these same institutions were forced to add professional work, especially law, to their offerings.

Despite the fact that some of the state-supported Negro colleges are still deficient to the extent that they do not meet the standards of their regional accrediting agency, they probably will continue to offer graduate work leading to the master's degree. In fact, the demand for such work for higher teacher certification, the encouragement, if not pressure, of state officials, insisting that such work be offered (to relieve the demand upon the state universities), the absence of desegregated white higher institutions in the "hard core" states, and the possible increasing difficulty of admission to the state universities as enrollments go up, all point to the continuance of graduate work, especially in education and allied fields, on the master's level in Negro colleges.

DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

One of the most dramatic and far-reaching events which have occurred during the past 20 years—practically the last 10 years—in the higher education of Negroes, has been the desegregation of almost half of the formerly segregated white higher institutions in the South. While desegregation has taken place largely on a token basis in the middle South and has not occurred at all in tax-supported

⁴ ——— "Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education of Negroes, 1948-49." *Journal of Negro Education* 18:568-575, Fall 1949.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 23:139-151.

institutions in four deep South states, an appreciable amount of desegregation has taken place in the Border and Southwestern states. (See Johnson.) This event has posed a number of problems, as well as opened up a number of possibilities in the field of Negro higher education.

One of the constructive possibilities opened up by desegregation of higher education in the South is the opportunity afforded Negro students to matriculate in the state universities to pursue work in highly specialized fields such as engineering, law, medicine, agriculture, and the like. A sizable number of Negro state institutions have been trying to offer work in most of these fields to accommodate Negro students who were being refused admission to these curricula in the white state universities. This duplication of offerings was not only pedagogically indefensible, but the institutions could ill afford the extra burden upon their resources.

Desegregation of higher education in the South, as far as students are concerned, has not been entirely a one-way street. (See Johnson.) As anticipated, Negro institutions on the average enrolled only a handful of white students. There are five Negro institutions, however,—mostly in the border states, and all state-supported—where the number of white students constituted at least ten per cent of the total enrollment of each in 1957, running as high as 50 per cent in one institution.⁶

This situation, although admittedly an exception, is noted here because it suggests some of the conditions which will probably have to obtain if it is to become more general. First, all of these institutions are located in or near urban areas where there is an appreciable amount of "white collar" employment; where considerable desegregation in other areas of community life has been effected, including in all but one instance, the public schools; and where the general race relations climate is at least "fair." Second, all of these institutions are fully approved by their regional accrediting agencies; offer evening courses designed for employed adults; and have desegregated teaching staffs.

Despite the possibilities which this example suggests, it does not seem likely that the majority of Negro colleges will have large white enrollments in the immediate future. And there are several reasons which may account for this; one of the most important being the unwillingness of most white students to face "the stigma

⁶ See: *Desegregation and the Negro College*. 27th Yearbook, *Journal of Negro Education*, 1958. Chapters VI, IX, VIII and XV. Out of a total enrollment of 5984 in these institutions, 1815 or 30% were white.

attached to pioneering against a taboo." Moreover, in several states, even where there has been some desegregation of the white state universities, white state officials have definitely frowned upon, and, in some cases, actually forbidden, the acceptance of white students by the Negro state colleges. As for the Negro private colleges, most of them are located in the deep South where little or no desegregation has taken place in anything.

The fact that there is an appreciable number of white students in several Negro colleges has elicited some curiosity, if not concern, as to their adjustment. All of the evidence obtained to date indicates that the adjustment of these students has not only been made without notable incident but has been unusually constructive. (See Aber.) In fact, it appears that the adjustment of white students in former Negro colleges probably has not been as difficult as for Negro students in the former white college, certainly no more difficult. And this would be expected, if for no reason than that the white students who enroll in a formerly segregated Negro college are considerably above the average in racial attitudes, as well as social maturity.

In general, it appears that faculties and students in both formerly segregated white and Negro institutions have done a good job of providing a congenial atmosphere; sometimes, even in face of open opposition from the non-academic community. (See Aber, Bittle and Johnson.) As the proportion of white students in Negro colleges and the number of Negroes in white colleges increase, however, problems in the areas of social and extracurricular activities will probably increase in number and difficulty. It is to be hoped that they will be met and resolved with as much firmness and common sense as they have been to date.

CHANGE IN SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION POLICY

In 1957, there were 85 four-year colleges in the country as a whole⁷ and 67 of these were in the area of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The recent change in the Association's rating policy (long overdue), so as to accredit Negro colleges on identically the same standards as the white colleges in its area, involves approximately four-fifths of all four-year Negro colleges. And it is expected that this action will affect the prospect of Negro higher education in a most decisive manner.

As a result of the first application of the Association's new policy in 1957, it was found that some two-thirds of the 67 four-year Negro

⁷ This figure does not include Atlanta University, Meharry Medical College, and the new consolidated theological seminary in Atlanta.

colleges in the area did not meet all of the standards.⁸ In 1958, some 7 additional institutions were fully approved,⁹ making a total of 29 (or 43 per cent) of these 67 institutions fully approved, and 38 (or 57 per cent) of the institutions still to gain approval—14 public and 24 private.

While it is not known exactly what the main deficiencies of the unapproved colleges were, unofficial reports (see Trent) indicate that most of them were short on standards which require additional financial resources. The Association requires among other things that four-year private colleges must have a minimum endowment of \$300,000 and expend at least \$300 for each full-time student or equivalent "on the more direct instructional processes." Most of the unapproved colleges were short on one or the other or both of these standards.¹⁰

It is going to be difficult, if not impossible for some of the Negro four-year colleges to become fully approved by 1961, the deadline.¹¹ Despite this fact, however, the new rating policy will have served and will continue to serve a most useful purpose for Negro higher education. It is expected, certainly hoped, that it will be a strong enough stimulus to force some reformations long overdue. In each of five states, for example, there are two Negro colleges located in the same city—in two cases only a street divides them. Six of these ten schools are "on probation," three do not meet "one or more standards," and one is not even listed. Nothing to date has been able to influence these schools to do the obvious. The probability of lack of accreditation could be persuasive.

Another probable effect of the policy is that it may cause some institutions to revise their offerings, by reducing the number of fields in which work is now being given. Some of these four-year institutions might find it advisable to become junior colleges, as has occurred in a few instances. Practically all of the unaccredited four-year Negro colleges could meet the standards for junior colleges almost immediately. And there seems to be a clear indication that

⁸ *Proceedings of the Sixty-Second Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*, December 1957, pp. 9-17.

⁹ Report from the Louisville meeting of the Association, 1958.

¹⁰ Some 13 institutions did not have the minimum endowment in 1956, according to unpublished data in the U. S. Office of Education. And it is practically certain that a like number did not meet the per capita expenditure standard even though they possessed the endowment.

¹¹ "By 1961 a college for Negroes must either qualify for membership in the Association or lose its accredited status, since the separate list will not be maintained after that date." See *Proceedings*, 1957, p. 154.

some colleges will be forced to eliminate offerings in such specialized fields as law, engineering, agriculture and the like.

Finally, this policy will make it possible for Negro colleges to attract a larger enrollment of white students. For when it is known that Negro colleges have been really approved on the same standards as the white, and as admission to higher institutions becomes more difficult, many white students will be much less reluctant to pioneer.

THE UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND

The typical Negro four-year private college is a small, church-related liberal arts-teacher training institution, with an enrollment of between 400 and 500 students and a student-teacher ratio of approximately one to 20. It has an endowment of less than half a million dollars, with little prospect of increasing it. Charges for tuition are much lower (in fact 40 per cent lower)¹² than the median tuition in private colleges in general. And its private gifts and grants for current purposes are derived from relatively unstable and unreliable sources.

The most pressing problem of Negro private colleges, as with most private colleges in general, is money. Endowments are woefully inadequate. In fact, the combined endowments of all Negro private colleges, plus all funds functioning as endowment, are less than the endowment of Northwestern University with only about half as many students. Tuition fees have always been lower than those of the average private college because of the poorer economic class from which their students are drawn. Moreover, tuition fees comprise only three-fourths as much of the current income of these colleges as of private colleges in general. And as for gifts and grants, while slightly larger per student than in private colleges in general, they are neither sufficient to make up the difference resulting from smaller endowment earnings and lower tuition fees, nor are they at all too assured.

The problems faced by Negro private colleges are acute. While endowments can not be expected to increase appreciably, some 13 of these colleges will have to do one of several things; namely, increase their endowments on the average by at least \$190,000; merge with other institutions; become junior colleges; go out of business; or worse, try to exist as unaccredited institutions. In spite of the fact that the median income of Negro families is only 55 or 60 per

¹² Based upon unpublished data for the school year, 1955-56, in the U. S. Office of Education. In 1958, the highest tuition (\$535) in any Negro private college is only two-fifths as much as the highest in several Northern colleges.

cent as much as white families,¹³ tuition in Negro private colleges will have to be increased—probably by as much as 20 per cent. And obviously gifts and grants for current expenses must be increased and put on a much more stable basis.

These and other alternatives will require an educational statesmanship and leadership which few, if any, of these institutions possess individually. It is fortunate, therefore, that the UNCF has developed the nucleus of a cooperative type of endeavor which could be constructively decisive. The main, if not exclusive, concern of the UNCF has been the four-year *accredited* Negro private college—and it has done a remarkable job in aiding its 33 members. There are many obvious reasons why its objectives should be expanded and its membership extended so as to include all of the unaccredited four-year private colleges, as well as private junior colleges, accredited and unaccredited. Moreover, there does not appear to be any insuperable difficulty involved in taking such a step, even if it is thought desirable to set up different categories of membership.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The progress of Negro higher education during the past 20 years since the *Gaines* decision has been the most marked in any two previous decades of its history. The decision per se, however, was only partially responsible for this advance—the most direct result being the phenomenal growth of graduate work, particularly in Negro publicly-supported colleges. And the prospect is that, despite the desegregation of many of the white institutions in the South, graduate work leading to the master's degree, particularly in education and allied fields, will still have to be given by Negro institutions to meet the demand for such training by public school teachers.

During this period there has been an appreciable amount of desegregation of white higher institutions, particularly in the border states. As anticipated, more Negro students have been enrolled in former white institutions than whites in Negro colleges; in fact, three times as many. But there has been an appreciable white enrollment in a few Negro colleges—just enough to suggest a possible trend. The prospect is that, while most Negro colleges will continue to have predominantly Negro enrollments for some time, the number of white students enrolling in Negro colleges will show a slow but steady increase; if for no other reason than the difficulty of getting admission to higher institutions in general as enrollment continue to rise.

The change in the rating policy of the Southern Association has

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

created acute problems for over 50 per cent of the four-year Negro colleges in the area. It is destined, however, to be one of the most powerful stimuli which these institutions have had in the past 25 years, to effect certain reforms that have been long overdue. And what is even more important, this action of the Southern Association is a long step toward the incorporation of Negro colleges in the mainstream of American higher education.

The Negro private college is having acute financial problems just as private colleges in general. But, in addition, more than half of the four-year Negro private colleges in the Southern Association area have not as yet (1958) attained full accreditation. Most of these institutions will not be able to qualify by 1961, or even later, unless some extraordinary aid is given them. The most encouraging prospect in an otherwise dark picture is that the United Negro College Fund may be persuaded by the logic of events to play a broader and more significant leadership role in the development of Negro private colleges in the future than it has in the past.

Chas. H. Thompson is Dean of the Graduate School, Howard University.